ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 11/1/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED002554
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). N.A.
3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.
4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Migratory Labor in Colorado
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.
7. EDITOR(S): N.A.
8. PLACE OF ORIGIN Colorado
ORG. Legislative Council,
ST. Denver, Colorado
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Colorado Legislative Council, Denver, Colorado
10. VOL. N.A.
11. PAGES N.A.
12. MO./YR. 12/62
13. TOTAL PP. 255

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA
15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)	housing	bracero program	minimum wage legislation
migratory labor	sanitation	labor contractors	unemployment insurance
health needs	migrant education	crew leaders	Federal legislation migrant
health program	migrant schools	migrant studies	child labor

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Conditions and problems relating to the employment of seasonal farm workers and migrants in Colorado are presented. The five major seasonal farm labor state employment areas are surveyed according to: the organization of the seasonal farm labor market; housing, health, and sanitation; education; trends in agricultural acreage, production, and technological change; community attitudes and programs; state and Federal legislation; and the composition, attitudes, and problems of the seasonal farm labor force.

The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee recommends that: (1) The state department of health should extend its inspection of sanitary facilities and water supplies at migrant housing facilities, and the health department should initiate an education program to assist the sponsors of migrant labor camps to improve facilities. (2) The state employment department should refuse to refer seasonal farm workers to growers whose housing does not meet standards. (3) The state employment department should expand its participation in the Annual Worker Plan, recruit local workers and interstate migrants to the fullest extent, and expand efforts in the effective utilization and reallocation of interstate seasonal farm workers. (4) The state education department and local school districts should expand the successful operation of migrant summer school programs.

ERIC No.
18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION
20. DIVISION OR DEPT.
21. CONTRACT NO.
PROJECT NO.
22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT
23. DURATION OF PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED002554

Report to the Colorado General Assembly:

MIGRATORY LABOR

IN COLORADO

1876

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

COLORADO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

RESEARCH PUBLICATION NO. 72

DECEMBER 1962

J0673

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

OF THE

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Senators

James E. Donnelly, Chairman
Charles E. Bennett
L. T. Skiffington
Floyd Oliver
Ranger Rogers
Robert L. Knous, Lt. Governor

Representatives

Guy Poe, Vice Chairman
Ruth B. Clark
John L. Kane
C. P. Lamb
Albert J. Tomsic
M. R. Douglass
Elmer A. Johnson

Lyle C. Kyle, Director

* * * * * * * *

The Legislative Council, which is composed of five Senators, six Representatives, and the presiding officers of the two houses, serves as a continuing research agency for the legislature through the maintenance of a trained staff. Between sessions, research activities are concentrated on the study of relatively broad problems formally proposed by legislators, and the publication and distribution of factual reports to aid in their solution.

During the sessions, the emphasis is on supplying legislators, on individual request, with personal memoranda, providing them with information needed to handle their own legislative problems. Reports and memoranda both give pertinent data in the form of facts, figures, arguments, and alternatives.

MIGRATORY LABOR IN COLORADO

Legislative Council
Report To The
Colorado General Assembly

Research Publication No. 72
December, 1962

ED002554

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1876

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

OFFICERS
JAMES E. DONNELLY
CHAIRMAN
GUY POE
VICE CHAIRMAN

STAFF
LYLE C. KYLE
DIRECTOR
HARRY O. LAWSON
SENIOR ANALYST
PHILLIP E. JONES
SENIOR ANALYST
DAVID F. MORRISSEY
RESEARCH ASSISTANT
MYRAN H. SCHLECHTE
RESEARCH ASSISTANT

MEMBERS
LT. GOV. ROBERT L. KNOUS
SEN. CHARLES E. BENNETT
SEN. JAMES E. DONNELLY
SEN. FLOYD OLIVER
SEN. RANGER ROGERS
SEN. L. T. SKIFFINGTON

SPEAKER ALBERT J. TOMSIC
REP. RUTH B. CLARK
REP. M. R. DOUGLASS
REP. ELMER A. JOHNSON
REP. JOHN L. KANE
REP. C. P. LAMB
REP. GUY POE

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
ACOMA 2-9911 - EXTENSION 2285

December 12, 1962

To Members of the Forty-fourth Colorado General Assembly:

The Legislative Council is submitting herewith its final report on the migratory labor study, as directed by the terms of House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) and House Joint Resolution No. 4 (1962).

The committee appointed by the Legislative Council to make this study submitted its report on November 30, 1962, at which time the report was accepted by the Legislative Council for transmittal to the General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Donnelly

James E. Donnelly
Chairman

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OFFICERS
JAMES E. DONNELLY
CHAIRMAN
GUY POE
VICE CHAIRMAN

STAFF
LYLE C. KYLE
DIRECTOR
HARRY O. LAWSON
SENIOR ANALYST
PHILLIP E. JONES
SENIOR ANALYST
DAVID F. MORRISSEY
RESEARCH ASSISTANT
MYRAN H. SCHLECHTE
RESEARCH ASSISTANT

MEMBERS
LT. GOV. ROBERT L. KNOUS
SEN. CHARLES E. BENNETT
SEN. JAMES E. DONNELLY
SEN. FLOYD OLIVER
SEN. RANGER ROGERS
SEN. L. T. SKIFFINGTON

SPEAKER ALBERT J. TOMSIC
REP. RUTH B. CLARK
REP. M. R. DOUGLASS
REP. ELMER A. JOHNSON
REP. JOHN L. KANE
REP. C. P. LAMB
REP. GUY POE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
ACOMA 2-9911 - EXTENSION 2285

December 12, 1962

Senator James E. Donnelly, Chairman
Colorado Legislative Council
341 State Capitol
Denver 2, Colorado

Dear Senator Donnelly:

Transmitted herewith is the final report and recommendations of the Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor. This committee was appointed pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961), and the study was continued under the provisions of House Joint Resolution No. 4 (1962). The report covers the committee's extensive field study in the five major seasonal farm labor employment areas in the state. Special attention has been given to the organization of the seasonal farm labor market; housing, health, and sanitation; education; trends in agricultural acreage, production, and technological change; community attitudes and programs; state and federal legislation; and last (but not least) the composition, attitudes, and problems of the seasonal farm labor force.

First overall

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative M. R. Douglass
Chairman, Committee on
Migratory Labor

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

FOREWORD

This study was made under the provisions of House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) and House Joint Resolution No. 4 (1962). These resolutions continued the migratory labor study which was originally authorized by Senate Joint Resolution No. 21 (1960) and directed the Legislative Council to report its findings and recommendations to the Forty-fourth General Assembly prior to or upon its convening in 1963. In effect, the Council was directed by these resolutions to cover all pertinent aspects of the economic and social conditions and employment of migrant workers and their families.

The Legislative Council committee appointed to make this study included: Representative M. R. Douglass, Grand Junction, Chairman; Senator Robert E. Allen, Denver, Vice Chairman; Senator Charles E. Bennett, Denver; Senator Raymond W. Braiden, La Jara; Senator Allegra Saunders, Denver; Representative James A. Braden, Colorado Springs; Representative Edwin S. Lamm, Grand Junction; Representative Noble M. Love, La Salle; Representative William E. Myrick, Englewood; Representative H. Ted Rubin, Denver; Representative Raymond H. Simpson, Cope; and Representative Betty Kirk West, Pueblo.

The Council staff work on this study was the primary responsibility of Harry O. Lawson, senior research analyst, assisted by Myran Schlechte, research assistant, who was in charge of the field study and migrant interviews. D. Edward Garcia, senior, University of Colorado Law School, assisted in the field study during the 1961 and 1962 growing seasons and also served as Spanish interpreter. Francis Nakai, Navajo Reservation, Shiprock, New Mexico, was employed as a Navajo interpreter in 1961 in the San Juan Basin and during potato harvest in the San Luis Valley.

The Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor held 17 meetings between April 1961 and November 1962. Nine of these meetings were regional public hearings, which were held in Rocky Ford, Lamar, Alamosa, Monte Vista, Palisade, Cortez, Brush, Fort Lupton, and Greeley. At these hearings growers; processors; federal, state, and local officials; legislators; community leaders; and interested citizens met with the committee to discuss problems and conditions related to the employment of migrant farm workers.

In connection with the regional hearings, the committee examined migrant housing, observed the special migrant summer school programs, visited packing and processing plants, and observed workers in the fields. The staff field study made in conjunction with the regional meetings included interviews with migrants, growers, processors, government officials, and community leaders and extended examination of housing and both government and private programs related to migrant farm workers and their families.

While the resolution authorizing the study directed attention only to migratory farm workers and their families, the committee examined all aspects of the employment of all seasonal farm workers, as well as agricultural trends and conditions with respect to markets, acreage, production, mechanization, and technological change. This was considered necessary in order to place the employment and problems of migrant workers in proper perspective.

The committee wishes to express its deep appreciation to the many federal, state, and local government officials who provided information and consultation during the course of the study. In particular the committee would like to thank the following:

Federal Officials: Miss Gwen Geach and Miss Mildred Dougherty, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor; Roy West and Alyn Trego, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

State and Local Officials: Bernard E. Teets, Director, State Department of Employment and the members of his staff including the director of employment service, the field supervisors, the director of the farm placement service and local office managers; Guy R. Justis, Director, State Department of Welfare; Mrs. Ruth Pierce, Director of Field Services, State Department of Welfare, and county welfare directors; Dr. Ruth Howard, Director, Child Health Services Division, State Department of Public Health, and members of her staff; local health department officials generally and George J. Houck, Director of the Otero County Health Department in particular; Lionel Moss, Colorado Industrial Commission; Chief Gilbert Carrel, Colorado State Patrol and patrol officers in the areas visited by the committee; Dr. Alfred Potts and Mrs. Lucile Latting, State Department of Education, and the principals and teachers of the special migrant summer schools; and J. L. Rice, Executive Director, Weld County Housing Authority. There are many more, too numerous to name, to which the committee also wishes to express its thanks.

In addition, the committee would like to thank the growers, processors, and growers' association officials for their assistance. Further the committee would like to recognize Dr. Jack H. Gore, Colorado School of Mines, for the data prepared in connection with his doctorial dissertation which he made available to the committee and the staff.

The committee's report is lengthy because it covers the first over-all field study made in Colorado of the conditions and problems relating to the employment of seasonal farm workers generally, and migrants in particular. It is the committee's hope that the data contained herein will provide the source material needed in future consideration by the General Assembly of legislation related to migrant farm workers.

December 12, 1962

Lyle C. Kyle
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL iii

FOREWORD vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS ix

COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS xxvi

FOCUSING ON THE PROBLEM 1

- Importance of Migrant Workers 1
- Legislative Concern 1
  - 1960 Legislative Study 2

- Present Legislative Study 4
  - Committee Meetings 5
  - Committee Tours 5
  - Topics Discussed at Regional Meetings 6
  - Field Study 7
    - Migrant Interviews 7
    - Other Aspects of Field Work 7
  - Area Differences 11

ARKANSAS VALLEY 12

- Crop Activities and Acreage 12
  - Crops Using Seasonal Farm Labor 12
    - Sugar Beets 12
    - Other Crops 13
  - Recent Trends in Acreage and Production 14
    - Sugar Beets 14
    - Broomcorn 14
    - Other Crops 14
    - Number of Farms and Average Size 14
  - Mechanization and Technological Change 15
    - Sugar Beets 15
    - Onions 16
    - Other Crops 16
  - The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes 16

- Seasonal Farm Labor Employment 17
  - Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods 17
    - Employment Department Statistics 18

- Labor Market Organization 22
  - Recruitment 22
    - Empire Field Crops 22
    - American Crystal Sugar Co. 22
    - Dave Nava 22
    - Mexican Nationals 23
  - Labor Utilization and Reallocation 23
    - Employment of Labor Contractor Crews 24
    - Further Comments on Labor Reallocation 25
    - Broomcorn Harvest 26

Page

Wage Rates and Earnings 26
Effect of Braceros on Wage Rates for Domestics 28
Wage Rate Determination 29
Wages Received by Migrant Workers 29

Housing, Sanitation, and Health 30
Housing and Sanitation 30
Concentrated Housing 31
Housing Subleases 32
On-the-farm Housing 32
Employment Department Inspections 33
Migrant Care of Housing 33
Otero County Health Department 34
Health Program and Needs 34
Migrant Nurse Program 34
Health Needs 34

Education and Welfare 35
Migrant Schools 35
Lamar Area 36
Regular School Attendance 36
Migrant Attitude Toward Education 36
Welfare 37
Day Care 37

The Migrant 37
The Migrant Generally 38
Single Migrants 39
Statistical Information 40

The Migrant and the Community 43
Community Attitudes 43
Organized Programs 44
Law Enforcement Problems 44

SAN LUIS VALLEY 45

Crop Activities and Acreage 45
Crop Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor 45
Potatoes 45
Other Vegetables 45
Crop Values 46
Recent Trends in Acreage and Production 46
Potatoes 46
Other Vegetables 47
Change in Number and Size of Farms 47
Mechanization and Technological Changes 48
Other Vegetables 48
The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes 49
General Economic Conditions 50

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment 51
Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods 51
Employment of Locals 51
Mexican Nationals 53
Interstate Workers 53
Employment Department Statistics 53

Page

- Labor Market Organization 53
  - Recruitment -- Crops Other than Potatoes 53
    - San Luis Valley Growers' Association 53
    - Brown and Martin 54
    - Employment Department 54
    - Individual Growers 54
    - Filipino Lettuce Crews 55
    - Individual Workers and Families 55
  - Recruitment -- Potatoes 55
  - Utilization and Reallocation of Labor 56
    - Workers Who Leave the Area Early 56
    - Potato Harvest 57
  - Wage Rates and Earnings 57
    - Lettuce Harvest 57
    - Potato Harvest 60
    - 1962 Wage Rates 61
    - Earnings 61

- Housing, Sanitation, and Health 63
  - Housing and Sanitation 63
    - Employment Department Inspections 63
  - Health Programs and Needs 64
    - Occupational Health 64

- Education and Welfare 65
  - Migrant Schools 65
    - Costilla County 65
    - Monte Vista 65
    - 1962 Summer Program 65
  - Regular School Attendance 66
  - Migrant Attitude Toward Education for Their Children 66

- Welfare 67

- The Migrant 68
  - Number of Interviews 68
  - The Migrant Generally -- A Profile 68
    - Spanish American -- Married 68
    - Spanish American -- Single 69
    - Filipino 70
    - Indian 70
    - Statistical Information 71

- The Migrant and the Community 75
  - Law Enforcement 75

THE WESTERN SLOPE 76

- Crop Activities and Acreage 76
  - Crops Using Seasonal Labor 76
    - Grand Junction Area 76
    - Delta Area 76
  - Recent Trends in Acreage and Production 77
  - Mechanization and Technological Change 78
  - The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes 78

Page

Pertinent Economic Conditions 79
Sugar Factory 79
Proposed Winery 80
Canneries 80

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment 80
Number of Workers -- Peak Employment 80
Recent Trends 81
Longer Range Trends 81
Mexican Nationals 81
Employment Department Statistics 82

Labor Market Organization 82
Recruitment 82
Peaches 82
Other Crops 83
Utilization and Reallocation 83
Reallocation 84
State Worked in Previously 85
Employment After Peach Harvest 85
Wage Rates and Earnings 88

Housing, Sanitation, and Health 89
Housing and Sanitation 89
Palisade Camp 90
Other Housing 90
Sanitation 91
Health Program and Needs 91

Education and Welfare 94
Migrant School 94
Palisade 94
Regular School Attendance 94
Attitude Toward Education 95
Day Care 95
Vocational Training Program 96
Welfare 96

The Migrant 97
Number Interviewed 97
Years as a Migrant Worker 98
Home State 100
Length of Time in Colorado 100
Reasons for Working in Colorado 101
Return to Colorado Next Year 101
Reasons for Working at Seasonal Farm Labor 102
Winter Employment 102

The Migrant and the Community 103
Community Attitude 103
Mesa County Migrant Council 103
Peach Board of Control 104
Law Enforcement Problem 104

Page

THE SAN JUAN BASIN 106

Crop Activities and Acreage 106
  Crops Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor 106
    Recent Trends in Acreage and Production 106
  Mechanization and Technological Change 108
  The Grower -- Problem and Attitudes 108

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment 109
  Number of Workers -- Peak Employment 109
    Long Range Trends 110
    Employment Department Statistics 110
    Use of Local Workers 110
  Recruitment 110
    Number and Source 111
  Labor Market Organization 111
  Wage Rates and Earnings 111

Housing, Sanitation, and Health 112
  Housing and Sanitation 112
  Health Needs 113

Education and Welfare 115
  Education 115
    School Attendance 115
    Need for Summer School 115
    Attitude Toward Education 116
  Welfare 116

The Migrant 117
  Number Interviewed 117
  Years as a Migrant Worker 117
  Home State of the Migrant 119
  Length of Stay in Colorado 119
  Attitudes Toward Working in Colorado 119
  Winter Employment 120

The Migrant and the Community 121
  Community Attitudes 121
  Law Enforcement Problems 121

NORTHERN COLORADO 122

Crop Activities and Acreage 122
  Crops Using Seasonal Labor 122
    Sugar Beets 122
    Potatoes 123
    Other Crops 123
  Recent Trends in Acreage and Production 125
    Sugar Beets 125
    Potatoes 125
    Other Crops 125
    Cherries 125
    Number of Farms and Size 125

Page

Mechanization and Technological Change 126
  Sugar Beets 126
  Snap Beans 126
  Potatoes 127
  Cucumbers 127
  Other Crops 127
The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes 127

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment 129
  Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods 129

Labor Market Organization 131
  Recruitment 131
    Sugar Beets 131
    Potatoes 132
    Vegetables 132
    Cucumbers 132
    Mexican Nationals 133
  Labor Utilization and Reallocation 133
    Use of Local Labor 135
  Youth Employment Service 136
  Wage Rates and Earnings 136
    Wages Received by Workers 138

Housing, Sanitation, and Health 139
  Housing and Sanitation 139
    Ft. Lupton Camp 139
    Other Camps 143
    Other Housing 144
  Health Programs and Needs 144
    Northeast Colorado Health Department 144
    Weld County Health Department 145
    Tri-County Health Department 145
    Boulder County Health Department 145
    Larimer County Health Department 145

Education and Welfare 146
  Migrant Schools 146
    Wiggins School 146
    Platteville School 146
  Need for Migrant Summer Schools 147
  Migrant Attitude Toward Education 148
  Welfare 148

The Migrant 150
  Years as a Migrant Worker 150
  Home State 152
  Length of Time in Colorado 152
  Reasons for Working in Colorado 153
  Reasons for Returning to Colorado 153
  Reasons for Doing Seasonal Farm Work 154
  Winter Employment 154

The Migrant and the Community 155
  Programs for Migrants 156
  Law Enforcement Problems 156

Page

THE SEASONAL FARM LABOR MARKET 157

Importance of Farm Labor Market Organization 157
  Relationship of Employment Pattern and Earnings 157
    Differences Between Family and Single Workers 157
    Reasons for Differences in Family Group Weekly Earnings 159
  Worker Guarantees 159
  Annual Worker Plan 160

Characteristics of the Seasonal Farm Labor Market 163
  Legislation, Regulations, and Governmental Action Affecting the Farm Labor Market in Colorado 165

State Department of Employment 166
  Employment Department Relationship with U.S. Bureau of Employment Security 166
  Farm Placement Division 167
    Governor's Farm Labor Advisory Council 167
  Functions of the Farm Placement Division 167

March 16, 1962 Meeting With Employment Department 168
  Comprehensive Farm Labor Requirement Plan 168
    Explanation 168
    Employment Department 168
    Other States 169
    Explanation 171
    Employment Department 171
    Other States 171
  Utilization of Local Labor 172
    Explanation 172
    Employment Department 172
    Other States 173
    Explanation 175
    Employment Department 176
    Other States 176
  Utilization of Intrastate Workers 178
    Explanation 178
    Employment Department 178
    Other States 178
  Allocation and/or Reallocation of Workers in a Given Area 179
    Explanation 179
    Employment Department 181
    Other States -- Reallocation 182
    Other States -- Referral to Other Areas 183
  Census of Seasonal Farm Workers 184
    Explanation 184
    Employment Department 184
    Other States 184
  Formal Contract for Domestic Workers 185
    Explanation 186
    Bureau of Employment Security 186
    Employment Department 186
  Activities of the Farm Placement Service 187
    Cost of Farm Labor Activities 187

Page

The Bracero Program 187
  1961 Legislation 189
  Wage Determination 190
  Department of Labor Hearings 190
    Effect of Bracero Wage Rates on Domestic Rates 192
  Employment of Mexican Nationals in Colorado 192
  Reactions to the Bracero Program 193
    Pro 193
    Con 194
  Future of the Bracero Program 194

OTHER PROBLEMS AND PROGRAMS 195

Health 195
  Brief History of Migrant Health Programs and Services 195
  Health Problems 195
  Obstacles to Health Care Utilization 196
  Occupational Health Problems 196
  Health Department Request 197

Housing and Sanitation 197
  Studies and Legislation Since 1950 197
  Present Housing and Sanitation Status 198
  Committee Housing Examination 199
  Proposed Legislation for the Regulation of Migrant Labor Camps 200
  Employment Department Housing Inspections 203

Regulatory Labor Legislation 203
  Minimum Wage Legislation 203
  Workmen's Compensation 204
  Unemployment Insurance Coverage 205
  Child Labor 205

Regulation of Labor Contractors and Crew Leaders 206
  Previous Recommendations and Legislative Proposals 206
    House Bill 62 207
  Experinece With House Bill 62 (1960) 207
    1961-1962 208
  H.B. 396 (1961) 208
  Problems and Alternatives 209

Transportation 210
    I.C.C. Regulations 210
    Effect of I.C.C. Regulations 210
    Ports of Entry 211
  1961 Legislation 211
  Method of Traveling to Colorado 211

Migrant Studies and Coordinating Committees 212
  1950-1951 Migratory Labor Study 212
    Recommendations Contained in the 1950-1951 Study 212
  Proposed Regulation 1951-1955 213
  Governor's Interagency Committee on Migratory Labor 214
    Farm Labor Advisory Committee 215
  Committees in Other States 215

Page

- Education 215
  - Findings of the 1950-1951 Study 215
  - Migrant Summer Schools 215
  - U.S. Office of Education Grant 216
  - Financing of Migrant Summer Schools 217
    - Regular Term Schools 217
  - Cooperative School Attendance Programs 218
  - Continuing Needs 218

- Welfare 219
  - Questionnaires 219
    - Extent of Financial Assistance 220
    - Reasons Why Assistance Requested 220
    - Reasons Why Assistance is Rejected 220
    - Other Services Provided Migrants by County Welfare Department 220
    - Organized Approach in Assisting Migrants 220
    - Evaluation of Assistance Program 221
    - Need for Expanded Services 221

THE GROWER: TRENDS, TECHNOLOGY, AND PRODUCTION 222

- Number of Farms and Farm Size 222
- Acreage of Major Crops 222
  - Sugar Beets 222
  - Potatoes 223
  - Peaches 223
  - Onions 223
  - Pinto Beans 224
  - Broomcorn 224
  - Lettuce 224
  - Other Vegetables and Cantaloupes 225
  - Other Fruits 226
- Production 227
  - Sugar Beets 227
  - Potatoes 228
  - Onions 229
- Technological Changes and Mechanization 229
  - Sugar Beets 229
  - Potatoes 231
  - Fruits 231
  - Vegetables 232
- Grower Attitudes Toward Mechanization and Other Matters 232
  - Attitudes Toward Seasonal Farm Labor 233
  - Cultural Differences 233

LEGISLATION IN OTHER STATES RELATING TO MIGRANTS 235

- Minimum Wage Legislation 235
- Wage Payment and Wage Collection 235
- Workmen's Compensation 236
- Unemployment Insurance 237
- Crew Leaders and Contractors 237
- Child Labor in Agriculture 238
- Farm Labor Camps 239
  - Camps Covered 239

Page

License Requirements 239
Compliance and Penalty 240
Administrative Agency 241

Education 242
Migratory Labor Committees 242
  Composition of Committees 242
 Functions of Committees 243
  Arizona 243
  Delaware 243
  Florida 243
  Idaho 243
  Illinois 243
  Michigan 243
  Minnesota 243
  New Jersey 244
  New York 245
  North Carolina 245
  North Dakota 245
  Ohio 245
  Oregon 245
  Pennsylvania 245
  South Carolina 246
  Texas 246
  Washington 246
  Wisconsin 246

FEDERAL LEGISLATION: PROPOSED AND ENACTED 247

Legislative Proposals 247
 Explanation of Proposed Legislation 247
  Minimum Wage (S. 1122) 247
  Labor Contractor Regulation (S. 1126) 248
  Child Labor (S. 1123) 248
  Labor Force Stabilization (S. 1129) 249
  Agricultural Labor Relations (S. 1128) 250
  Education of Migrant Children (S. 1124) 251
  Education of Migrant Adults (S. 1125) 251
  Housing (S. 1127) 251
  Health Services (S. 1130) 253
  Child Welfare Services (S. 1131) 253
  National Citizens' Council (S. 1132) 253
 Action on Proposed Legislation 254
  Bills Passed 254
  Adopted by One House 254
  No Action 254

Other Legislation Affecting Migrants 254
 Application to Migrants 254
  Manpower and Area Redevelopment Acts 254
  Rural Housing Programs 255
  Day Care for Migrant Children 255

LIST OF TABLES

			Page
TABLE	1	Number and Location of Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962	8
	2	Number of People Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962	9
	3	Number of Farm Workers Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962	10
	4	Sugar Beets Acreage and Production, Arkansas Valley, 1961	12
	5	Broomcorn Acreage and Production, Arkansas Valley, 1960	13
	6	Cantaloupes and Vegetable Acreage, Arkansas Valley, 1960	13
	7	Number of Farms and Median Size, Arkansas Valley, 1950 and 1960	15
	8	Employment of Seasonal Farm Workers in the Arkansas Valley by Area for Selected Weeks and Principal Crop Activities, 1960-1962	19
	9	Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in the Arkansas Valley, 1961	30
	10	Average Weekly Wages from April 1st Until Time of Interview, Arkansas Valley, 1961	30
	11	State Department of Employment Housing Inspection, Arkansas Valley, 1962	33
	12	Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Arkansas Valley, 1961	37
	13	Number of Migrant Interviews and the Number of Workers and People Included, Arkansas Valley, June-July, 1961	38
	14	Years as a Migrant Worker, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961	40
	15	Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961	41
	16	Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or Not Work in Colorado, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961	41
	17	Return to Colorado Next Year, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961	42

Page

TABLE 18 Areas to Which Migrants Expect to Travel to Find Employment After Leaving the Arkansas Valley, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961 42

19 Winter Jobs of Arkansas Valley Migrants in 1960, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961 43

20 Weeks Worked and Total Winter Earnings of Arkansas Valley Migrants, 1960; Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961 43

21 Potatoes Planted and Harvested, San Luis Valley, 1960 45

22 Commercial Vegetables, Acres Harvested for Market, San Luis Valley, 1960 46

23 Comparison of Values for Potatoes, All Other Vegetables, and Other Crops, San Luis Valley, 1959 46

24 Number of Farms and Median Size, San Luis Valley, 1950 and 1960 47

25 Seasonal Farm Labor in the San Luis Valley by Type of Workers for Selected Weeks, 1961-1962 52

26 Wage Rates Received During Potato Harvest, San Luis Valley, 1961 60

27 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in the San Luis Valley, 1961 62

28 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, San Luis Valley, 1961 63

29 State Department of Employment Housing Inspections, San Luis Valley, 1962 64

30 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Luis Valley, 1961 67

31 Number of Migrant Interviews and Related Information by Ethnic Group, San Luis Valley, 1961 68

32 Years As a migrant Worker by Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961 71

33 Years As a Migrant Worker in Colorado By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961 72

34 Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or not Work in Colorado, By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961 73

35 Areas to Which Migrants Expected to Travel to Find Employment After Leaving the San Luis Valley, By Ethnic Group, 1961 74

Page

TABLE 36 1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Mesa County 76

37 1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Delta County 77

38 Number of Mesa County Farms Growing Peaches and Number of Trees, Number of Delta County Farms Growing Apples and Number of Trees, 1950-1960 78

39 Method of Finding Job on Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961 85

40 State Worked In Prior to Coming to The Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961 86

41 Travel and Work After Leaving Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961 87

42 Wage Rates Received During Peach Harvest, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961 88

43 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants on the Western Slope, 1961 88

44 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Western Slope, 1961 89

45 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Western Slope, 1961 95

46 Number of People Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961 97

47 Number of Workers Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961 97

48 Years As A Migrant Worker by Age, Western Slope Interviews, 1961 98

49 Years As A Migrant Worker and Years Worked In Colorado, Western Slope Interviews, 1961 99

50 Home States Of Migrant Workers, Western Slope Interviews, 1961 100

51 Length of Stay In Colorado By Time of Arrival, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961 101

52 Reasons For Working In Colorado, Western Slope Interviews, 1961 101

53 Return to Colorado Next Year, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961 102

54 Reasons For Doing Seasonal Farm Work, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961 102

Page

TABLE 55 Winter Employment of Migrants, Western Slope Interviews, 1961 102

56 Weeks Worked During Winter and Amount Earned 1960-1961, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961 103

57 1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Montezuma County 106

58 Bean Acreage and Harvest in the San Juan Basin in 1960 107

59 Number of Farms and Median Size, San Juan Basin, 1950 and 1960 107

60 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in the San Juan Basin, 1961 112

61 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st until Time of Interview, San Juan Basin, 1961 112

62 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Juan Basin, 1961 116

63 Number of People Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961 117

64 Number of Workers Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961 117

65 Years As A Migrant Worker By Age, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961 118

66 Years As A Migrant Worker in Colorado, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961 118

67 Length of Time In Colorado By Date of Arrival, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961 119

68 Reason for Working in Colorado, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961 119

69 Return to Colorado Next Year, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961 120

70 Winter Employment of San Juan Basin Migrant Workers, 1961 120

71 Weeks Worked During the Winter and Amount Earned, San Juan Basin Migrants, 1961 121

72 Sugar Beet Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1961 122

73 Potato Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1960 123

Page

TABLE 74 Cantaloupe, Onions, and Vegetable Acreage, Northern Colorado, 1960 124

75 Number of Farms and Median Size, Northern Colorado, 1950 and 1960 126

76 Total Workers in Northern Colorado by Area, 1960, 1961, 1962 130

77 Employment of Mexican Nationals in Northern Colorado During Selected Weeks, 1962 134

78 Method of Payment, Migrants Interviewed in Northern Colorado, 1962 137

79 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in Northern Colorado, 1962 138

80 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Northern Colorado, 1962 139

81 State Department of Employment Housing Inspections, Northern Colorado, 1962 144

82 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Northern Colorado, 1962 149

83 Number of Workers and Number of People Included, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962 150

84 Number of Years as a Migrant Worker and Number of Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado, Northern Colorado, 1962 151

85 Years As A Migrant Worker by Age of Interviewee. Northern Colorado, 1962 152

86 Length of Stay in Colorado By Time of Arrival Northern Colorado Migrant Interview, 1962 153

87 Reason for Working in Colorado, Northern Colorado Interviews, 1962 153

88 Return to Colorado Next Year, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962 154

89 Reason For Doing Seasonal Farm Work, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962 154

90 Winter Work of Seasonal Farm Laborers, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962 155

91 Weeks Worked During 1961-1962 Winter and Amount Earned, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962 155

Page

TABLE 92 Comparison of Earnings During Previous Week With Average Weekly Earnings From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Migrant Labor Interviews by Area, 1961 and 1962 158

93 Annual Worker Plan: Migrants Contacted and Employed by State, 1960 161

94 Growers' Association and Processors Severed By the Colorado Department of Employment, 1961 188

95 Bracero Wage Rates Established in 1962 and Average Farm Wage in 1961 for Selected States 191

95A Relationship of Bracero Wage Rates, 1961 and 1962 In Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas 191

96 Number of Farms, Median Size of Farms, and Per Cent Change 1950 to 1960, Selected Areas of Colorado 222

97 Sugar Beet Acreage in Colorado, 1950-1961 223

98 Potato Acreage in Colorado, 1950 and 1960 223

99 Onion Acreage in Colorado, Selected Areas, 1950 and 1960 224

100 Lettuce Acreage in Colorado, Selected Counties, 1950 and 1960 224

101 Other Vegetables and Cantaloupes Acreage in Colorado (Fresh Market), 1950 and 1960 226

102 Production of Apples, Cherries, and Pears, and Number of Bearing Trees by County, 1950 and 1960 227

103 Sugar Beet Yield Per Acre For Selected Years in Colorado 228

104 Colorado Potato Acreage, Yield Per Acre, and Total Production, 1946-61 228

105 Colorado Onion Acreage, Yield Per Acre, and Total Production, 1946-61 229

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Importance of Migrant Workers

Each year a large number of seasonal farm workers are needed in Colorado, not only at harvest time, but throughout the growing season as well. Only a small proportion of seasonal farm labor needs is met by local workers, especially during peak harvest periods. Consequently, seasonal farm workers from other states play an important role in Colorado's agricultural production. It is virtually impossible to determine accurately the total number of different workers from other states who come to Colorado during the course of a growing season; it is estimated, however, that at least 15,000 different interstate workers are employed during a normal crop year in this state.

Colorado ranks 12th among all states in the number of interstate migrant farm workers who are employed during the growing season. Among the Rocky Mountain and west coast states, Colorado ranks fourth in the number of interstate workers employed.

The size of the total seasonal farm labor force (local workers, intrastate workers, interstate workers, and Mexican nationals) has remained fairly constant in recent years, but the number of interstate workers has been declining. There has been a sharp decline in the past 15 years in both the total number of seasonal farm workers employed and in the number of interstate migrants. Mechanization, technological change, and a reduction in acreage in some of the crops requiring seasonal farm labor have been responsible for the decrease in the size of the seasonal labor force required. Even with this reduction, crops requiring seasonal farm workers are very important in Colorado's agricultural economy.

Present Legislative Study

House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) directed the Legislative Council to continue the study of migratory farm labor which had been started by a Legislative Council Committee in 1960. In authorizing the continuation of this study, House Joint Resolution No. 10 specified that the following subjects be included:

1) coordination of efforts by public agencies and statewide and local organizations in trying to solve the problems of migrant farm workers and their families;

2) cooperation between federal and state agencies to facilitate the recruitment, transportation, and placement of migrant farm workers;

3) economic problems of migrant farm workers;

4) community cooperation in providing social services for migrants;

5) migrant school programs; and

6) such other problems as may come within the purview of this study.

At its initial meeting on May 10, 1961, the members of the present Migrant Labor Committee agreed that an extensive field study was needed to develop as complete a picture as possible of the migrant farm worker and his problems in Colorado. The committee also decided to hold a series of regional meetings in conjunction with the field study and, in connection with these meetings, to tour migrant housing facilities and to observe migrant schools and other agency and community programs for migrants, whenever possible. In making the field study the committee authorized the staff to employ a Spanish and a Navajo interpreter and to seek the cooperation of public agency personnel concerned with migrants.

Because of the wide scope of the study, the amount of field work involved, and the overlap among areas in the peak employment of migratory farm workers, the committee determined that it would take the full two years provided in House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) to complete the study. During the first year, it was decided that the committee would cover the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Palisade area, and San Juan Basin. During the second year, attention would be focused on Northern Colorado, where the largest number of migrants are employed for an extended period.

Committee Meetings

During 1961 and 1962 the committee held nine regional public hearings. Public hearings were held as follows:

Arkansas Valley -- Rocky Ford and Lamar, June 5 and 6, 1961
San Luis Valley -- Alamosa and Monte Vista, July 19 and 20, 1961
Western Slope -- Palisade, August 18, 1961
San Juan Basin -- Cortez, August 21, 1961
Northern Colorado -- Brush, June 1, 1962
Ft. Lupton, July 19, 1962
Greeley, August 10, 1962

Invited to meet with the committee at these hearings were: growers, processors, labor contractors, legislators from the area, federal officials (Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Bureau of Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), state officials (departments of education, employment, health, and welfare, the Colorado highway patrol, and the Industrial Commission), local officials (education, health, welfare, sheriffs, police chiefs, mayors, county commissioners, and councilmen), community leaders, and interested citizens.

Prior to each series of regional meetings, the Council staff made a preliminary study of the area to compile background data for the committee and to develop a list of those who might be interested in meeting with the committee. Each person on the list received a personal invitation to attend from the chairman on behalf of the committee, and information concerning the meeting and invitations to all citizens to attend were sent to all newspapers and radio and television stations in the area. Approximately 550 people attended the public hearings: Rocky Ford, 60; Lamar, 30; Alamosa, 35; Monte Vista, 50; Palisade, 75; Cortez, 30; Brush, 75; Ft. Lupton, 150; and Greeley, 50.

Committee Tours

In connection with the Arkansas Valley meetings, the committee made two tours of migrant housing, one in the Rocky Ford-Manzanola-Swink area and the other in the Lamar-Granada area. The committee also spent one morning at the Rocky Ford school for migrant children. The committee examined housing facilities around Alamosa and Monte Vista, observed workers in the field during lettuce harvest, visited a lettuce packaging plant, and spent some time at the Monte Vista school for migrant children. At Palisade, the housing tour included both the Palisade camp and on-the-farm housing, and a visit was made to two peach and pear packing plants. The committee also spent some time at the Palisade migrant school. At the time of the Cortez meeting, there were few migrants in the area, so the committee visited two pinto bean packaging plants and the migrant housing there and traveled to the Navajo reservation to observe how Navajo migratory workers live at home. The committee visited the Wiggins school and examined housing in the area prior to the Brush meeting. The Fort Lupton meeting was preceded by a tour of the Fort Lupton migratory labor camp. Following the meeting, the committee visited the Platteville school. Several potato packing sheds and a cucumber processing plant were visited in connection with the Greeley meeting.

Topics Discussed at Regional Meetings

The same major topics were covered at each regional meeting, although there was some difference in the questions asked by the committee because of situations and problems which varied from area to area. In general, the following major topics were covered at each meeting:

1) number of seasonal farm workers employed, during what periods, and for what crops;

2) composition of the seasonal farm labor force and the sources of supply for such labor;

3) reasons for decrease in the number of interstate and intrastate migrants and the utilization of local labor for seasonal farm work;

4) employment of Mexican nationals;

5) relationship of processors, growers, growers' organizations, labor contractors, and the state employment service in the recruitment and utilization of seasonal farm labor;

6) agricultural marketing problems, extent of mechanization and technological improvements, need for further mechanization and technological improvement, availability of and need for packing and processing plants;

7) availability and adequacy of housing for seasonal farm workers;

8) migrant health and sanitation programs and needs;

9) migrant school programs and education needs;

10) law enforcement problems related to the migrant farm worker; and

11) community programs for and attitudes toward the migrant farm worker and his family.

Field Study

Interviews were completed with 706 migratory workers in 1961 and with 225 migratory workers in 1962. The 1961 interviews covered the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Slope, and San Juan Basin. The interviews in 1962 covered the following areas in Northern Colorado: 1) Morgan and Logan counties; 2) Ft. Lupton, Brighton, and Longmont; 3) Loveland and Fort Collins; and 4) the remainder of Weld County.

Six hundred and twenty-five of these interviews were made with family heads or other family members, so that information was obtained concerning other members in the family group. Consequently, the 931 completed interviews covered 3,219 people, of whom 1,811 were employed as farm laborers.

Migrant Interviews. The migrants who were interviewed were asked questions concerning the following: 1) age and place of residence; 2) number of years as a farm laborer and number of years as a farm laborer in Colorado; 3) crop activity in which employed and other crops in the area in which worker expects to be employed; 4) area or state where employed prior to present employment and expected location of next employment if different from present; 5) attitudes toward working in Colorado and toward employers and communities; 6) how present employment was obtained; 7) present rate of pay and amount made by worker and family during past week and since April 1 of this year; 8) number of days employed during past month and reasons for days of non-work; 9) place in which last winter was spent, employment during the winter, and amount earned; 10) comparison of home base or winter housing and present migrant housing; 11) family status, number and age of children, if employed or in school; 12) health status of worker and his family; and 13) financial status of worker and his family, expenditure for food, transportation, and other goods and services.

Other Aspects of Field Work. In addition to the completed migrant questionnaires, the field work included interviews with a representative number of growers, processors, labor contractors, growers' association officers, state and local officials, community leaders, and law enforcement officers. The subjects discussed during these interviews generally followed the topics covered at the committee's regional hearings, with the questions asked designed to develop more specific and detailed information.

More than 100 growers were interviewed. These growers were asked about their labor and marketing problems, labor utilization, mechanization, crop acreage, and recommendations concerning seasonal farm labor. Considerable time was spent with the growers, examining fields and observing crews at work.

Extensive interviews were made with processors and officials of growers' associations. Included in these interviews were: Western Canning Company, American Crystal Sugar Company, National Sugar Company, Holly Sugar Company, Divon Packing Company, Empire Field Crops (where the staff had the opportunity to attend a board meeting), San Luis Valley Growers Association, the Peach Board of Control, Great Western Sugar Company, Kuner-Empson, and the Fort Lupton Canning Company.

There were several reasons why the number of growers and processors interviewed was much smaller than the number of migrants:

1) The committee's public hearings were held for the purpose of meeting with growers, processors, public officials, and community leaders, so a much larger number of growers and processors were contacted by the committee than those interviewed by the staff.

2) The growers interviewed by the staff were selected because of crop activity, location, and amount of labor employed; generally, they were among the largest employers of seasonal farm labor in a given area.

3) The interviews with growers and processors took considerably longer than those with migrants. The average time per interview with growers and processors was two hours, and some took much longer.

Considerable time was spent in observing and examining local programs and services for migrants, such as the migrant nurse program, the work of the migrant ministry, school programs, and the employment department farm labor field service. Housing and sanitation facilities were examined, as were some of the vehicles used to transport migrant workers, and visits were made to agricultural experiment stations.

The field staff interviewed migrants either in the evening or on days when they were not working, so as not to interfere with agricultural activities. The other interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the interviewees.

Area Differences

The areas covered by the committee during the study differ to a considerable degree in many respects such as: 1) size and composition of the seasonal farm labor force; 2) crop activity and peak periods of labor utilization; 3) organization of the farm labor force and wage scales; 4) use of Mexican nationals; 5) public and private programs and services for migrants; and 6) community attitudes toward migrant workers. There are considerable variations within some areas as well.

The following examples illustrate these area differences:

Arkansas Valley. The major crops for which migrant labor is used are onions and sugar beets, with the exception of Baca County where broomcorn is the chief crop activity in which migrants are employed. Other crops for which seasonal farm labor is needed are melons, tomatoes, and cucumbers. All of the migrant workers (except for broomcorn) are Spanish Americans, mostly from Texas with a few from New Mexico. A large number of Cherokee Indians from Oklahoma are employed during broomcorn harvest. The early season peak for seasonal farm labor utilization is usually during the first part of June. The late season peak is usually in early September. This area is one of the three covered by the committee which uses a large number of Mexican nationals. The wage scale for seasonal farm laborers has been one of the lowest in the state ($.65 to $.75 per hour) but was increased with the imposition of a $.90 per hour minimum wage for Mexican nationals. This is also the area in which labor contractors play the largest role in recruiting interstate migrant workers.

There is little community concern over the migrant, and aside from the children's recreation program sponsored by the migrant ministry and a second hand store operated by the Rocky Ford Ministerial Alliance, there is no organized citizens' activity on behalf of the migrant. On the other hand, the migrant school program in Rocky Ford, in the committee's opinion, is excellent and has been operating for a number of years. The director of the Otero County Health Department has taken an active interest in housing and sanitation conditions and is doing the best job in this respect of any local health department official contacted by the committee. The migrant nurse program operated under health department auspices is also one of the best of its kind.

San Luis Valley. Potatoes, lettuce, and spinach (in that order) are the major crops for which seasonal farm labor is used in the San Luis Valley. Other crops involving the use of seasonal farm labor include peas, cauliflower, cabbage, and carrots. Potatoes are by far the most important crop, although lettuce and spinach are the major crops in Costilla County. There are two peak utilization periods of farm labor, corresponding to the harvest seasons for the major crops. The early season peak is reached by the middle of July and continues at this level through most of August (lettuce and spinach harvests). The late season peak is reached at the end of September and holds for three weeks during potato harvest. The potato harvest is concentrated primarily in the northern part of the valley, where two-thirds of the valley's potato acreage is located, while 85 per cent of the commercial vegetable acreage in the valley is located in the southern three counties (Alamosa, Conejos, and Costilla).

The domestic migrant workers in commercial vegetables, with the exception of lettuce, are primarily Spanish Americans, with most of these workers coming from New Mexico. Approximately 300 custom lettuce packers of Filipino origin are also employed during lettuce harvest. Very few of the Spanish Americans who work in vegetables remain for potato harvest. The potato harvest workers include a large number of Navajo Indians and Spanish Americans. The Spanish Americans generally come from New Mexico, although a number of Texas crews were found working in the southern three counties, and a large group of Spanish Americans who are residents of Costilla and Conejos counties migrate to Rio Grande and Saguache counties for potato harvest.

In addition to the difference in crop emphasis between the northern and southern parts of the valley, there is a wage differential in some instances; some workers in the northern counties receive from $.05 to $.20 an hour more. There is also a piece rate differential between the two parts of the valley during potato harvest; again, the rate is higher in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. Wage rates in the valley, especially in the southern counties, were among the lowest in the state in 1961. In these counties the hourly wage rates varied from $.60 to $.80 per hour and in the northern counties from $.75 to $1.00 per hour. Domestic wage rates increased in 1962 at the same time that the $.90 per hour minimum for Mexican nationals was imposed.

A large number of Mexican nationals are employed in the valley, and this number has been increasing annually during the past few years. There has been little community interest in migratory workers and no organized citizen activities. There is no organized health department in the valley, and the state health department sanitarian stationed in Alamosa has not given much attention to migrant housing and sanitation. There was a migrant nurse employed in the valley from 1956 through 1959, but there has been no program since that time. Three special summer school programs were operated in 1961, but these were attended for the most part by children who were residents. In 1962, only one summer school program was held; the other two were terminated because of the statutory requirement that state aid be given only for attendance by migrant children.

Grand Junction-Palisade Area. The crops for which seasonal farm labor is needed in the Grand Junction area include: peaches, cherries, pears, apples, tomatoes, and sugar beets. The largest number of seasonal workers by far are needed during peach harvest, which usually begins the third or fourth week in August and is largely concluded within 10 to 12 days. Most of the fruit in Mesa County is grown in the area surrounding Palisade. Sugar beets and tomatoes are concentrated in the Fruita area, west of Grand Junction. There is not much employment of seasonal farm labor prior to the third week in May. An early season peak is reached toward the end of June. Then there is a gradual reduction in the number of workers needed until peach harvest. Pear and tomato harvests usually continue until the latter part of September.

While a number of Mexican nationals are employed in sugar beets and tomatoes, there are none used for peach harvest. The peach harvest work force is composed of Anglos, Negroes, Spanish Americans, and some Indians. The wage scale is among the highest in the state, averaging about $1.00 per hour.

This area has the greatest amount of community interest in the migrant and his problems of any region visited by the committee. The Mesa County Migrant Council has been in operation for a number of years and is composed of interested citizens, many of whom are growers or public officials. An inexpensive clothing and houseware store is run for migrants; there is a day-care program and a medical care program. Although there is considerable community interest, there is still some indifference and hostility toward the migrant. The Palisade area, however, is confronted with a situation which has no parallel in any of the other areas covered by the committee, with the possible exception of the northern San Luis Valley during potato harvest. There is considerable congestion and disruption of normal community activity caused by the influx of a large number of workers and their families during a short period of time for the harvest of a very perishable crop.

The migrant school program has been in operation for a number of years but attracts fewer children than the Rocky Ford program. The migrant ministry has a team of three working in the area and quartered at the Palisade camp. This team works with the migrant council and in 1961 operated the day-care center and two vocational training programs for teenage and adult migrants.

The Palisade camp was closed in 1962 and the buildings sold to individual growers. As a result there were a number of workers sleeping along the river bank, adding to sanitation and health problems. The absence of the camp appeared to be the reason for the reduction in the number of family groups coming to the area for peach harvest in 1962.

San Juan Basin. Pinto bean harvest and pre-harvest are the chief agricultural activities for which seasonal farm labor is employed. Other crops which require a relatively small amount of seasonal farm labor are hay and apples. Almost all of the migrant laborers employed are Navajo Indians, although there are a few intrastate workers. There are no Mexican nationals employed in the area. Hourly wage rates vary from $.75 to $1.00, with most workers receiving $.75 or $.80 per hour. The seasonal farm labor peak is reached in the latter half of September during pinto bean harvest.

There is little community interest in the Navajo and his problems, and there are no special programs, either community or public agency sponsored, for these workers and their families in Montezuma County. In Dolores County, which is part of the San Juan Basin Health Department, a survey has been made as to the health and sanitation needs of the Navajo. The Navajo workers come from the reservation located near Shiprock, New Mexico. According to the answers received to the migrant questionnaire, none of the Navajos who work during pinto bean harvest planned to travel to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest. Conversely, none of the Navajos interviewed in the San Luis Valley during potato harvest had previously worked in pre-harvest activities in the San Juan Basin.

Northern Colorado. This area includes Adams, Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, and Weld counties, and more seasonal farm laborers (including migrants) are employed than in any other area of the state.

Sugar beets require the most labor of any single crop in Northern Colorado, with potatoes, onions, cucumbers, tomatoes, green beans, and other fresh vegetables requiring lesser amounts of seasonal labor. The hay, corn, wheat, and small grain crops grown extensively in this area require labor also, but most of the workers utilized in these crops are permanent employees, except for some seasonal workers used for irrigation and tractor operation. The need for seasonal farm labor begins in May and reaches a peak in June during pre-harvest activities in sugar beets. Labor needs in the whole Northern Colorado area then decline throughout the rest of the season, with variations from area to area. Between 10,000 and 12,000 seasonal farm workers are employed during the June peak period.

There is a higher degree of agricultural mechanization and technological innovation in Northern Colorado than in any other area of the state using large numbers of seasonal farm workers. This is most noticeable in sugar beet pre-harvest activities and in the harvest of some vegetable crops. The extensive use of monogerm seed and the more limited use of mechanical blocking and thinning has reduced sugar beet pre-harvest labor needs considerably in the past decade. The harvest of some vegetable crops for processing, notably snap beans, red beets, sweet corn, and green peas have been completely mechanized. Mechanization of potato and onion harvests has been increasing.

The wage rates in Northern Colorado are among the highest in the state, and the continuous need for seasonal farm labor throughout the growing season provides fairly continuous employment. Some of the domestic migrants are also employed in the canning and processing plants from time to time during the season. A large number of Mexican nationals are used in the area, especially during sugar beet pre-harvest, when more than 4,800 are employed (or 46 per cent of the total seasonal farm labor force at that time). The use of local seasonal labor is more widespread in certain parts of Northern Colorado than anywhere else in the state, with the exception of peach harvest on the Western Slope. Northern Colorado is more densely populated than any of the other major farm areas and has many more locals upon which to draw.

Migrant housing in Northern Colorado is among the best in the state, although there are some poor and inadequate housing units. The largest housing concentration is the Fort Lupton camp, which is operated by the Weld County Public Housing Authority. This camp has received national attention as a model facility of its type. Most other housing is located on individual farms.

There were two migrant summer schools operated in Northern Colorado in 1962, one at Platteville and the other at Wiggins. The Wiggins migrant school was the first to be established in the state, and the Platteville school (which replaced the Fort Lupton school) had the largest enrollment in the state.

Although all of the counties in the area are served by organized local health departments, the only health program for migrants was operated at the Fort Lupton camp. Community interest in migrants and their families appeared to be greater than in some other areas, although there are no organized programs to compare with those of the Mesa County Migrant Council.

Seasonal Farm Labor Market Organization

While not slighting the other problems related to migrant labor, the committee has given special attention to the organization of the farm labor market. In the committee's opinion, the effective recruitment, allocation, and utilization of farm labor is the central problem, and all other problems are related to it. Both the grower and the worker have a major interest in how the farm labor market is organized; the grower needs an assured labor supply throughout the growing season, but especially at certain specific times; the worker needs continuous employment in order to at least have some possibility of maintaining himself and his family during the growing season and to attempt to lay aside some savings for the winter months. The need for an assured labor supply is one reason why many growers favor the employment of Mexican nationals. More effective allocation and utilization of labor would result in a reduction of the number of workers needed.

Mechanization and technological improvement have altered the farm labor picture considerably in Colorado in recent years by reducing the need for seasonal farm labor, but not to the extent that this has occurred in some other states. There has also been progress in the recruitment and routing of labor, which has reduced the possibility of labor shortages in one area at the same time that there is a surplus of labor in another.

The committee's study of the farm labor market was aimed at determining whether further improvements can be made in the recruitment, allocation, and utilization of labor.

In developing information on this subject, the committee examined the functions of the State Department of Employment, growers' organizations, labor contractors, and processors with respect to the recruitment and allocation of labor. In addition, the committee gathered information on farm labor placement service operations in other states. (An extensive discussion of the farm labor market will be found on pp. 157-194 of the research report.)

Housing and Sanitation

During the past two years, the committee and field staff have examined all types of housing for migrant workers (both in camps and on the farm). Some of this housing was either good, or at least adequate, but some of it could not be considered adequate, even by minimum standards. Of special concern was the lack in many places of even minimum proper sanitary conditions. Lack of proper sewage and garbage disposal and inadequately protected water supplies can have a detrimental effect on nearby communities, as well as on the people living in the migrant housing.

In examining migrant housing, cognizance was taken that migratory workers live in this housing for a relatively short period of time. Failure to recognize this fact could lead to recommendations for housing standards which would be more restrictive than necessary, creating a considerable burden for growers. Further, housing conditions for migrants must be considered in light of resident housing in the same area. In some places, a portion of the resident housing is equally as bad as that provided for migrants. Many migrants also have poor housing in their state of residence, but the migrant interviews indicate that if many of these workers had sufficient income to afford better housing at their home base, they would not join the migrant stream year after year. The field study results indicate that adequate housing is an asset in attracting and keeping workers and is often a consideration in the worker's decision as to whether to return to the same farm or area in following years.

Concern has been expressed to the committee because there are no standards for housing for interstate and intrastate migratory workers, while there are standards promulgated by the United States Secretary of Labor for Mexican national housing. It has been suggested that at least these standards should be met for domestic workers. The state health department has recommended legislation to regulate and license farm labor housing providing for five or more workers. Improvement in housing and sanitation conditions will not result from the promulgation and enforcement of standards alone. In addition, an extensive education program is needed to instruct migrants in the proper use of facilities and the consequences of bad sanitation practices.

Other Programs and Problems

The committee has studied many other programs and problems related to migrant workers and their families including: education, welfare, health, day-care for small children, transportation, licensing and registration of crew leaders, and other matters.

Education. The field study and the committee's observations of several migrant schools indicate that the special migrant education program is quite successful, especially considering present limitations. The State Department of Education is to be commended for the leadership it has provided for this program and its continued research on the subject. Additional migrant schools may be needed, but in some areas there is a notable lack of interest in establishing such a program, even though it is financed entirely by the state. Further study is needed to determine the best way in which migrant children present during the regular school term might be integrated into the regular school program, although the provision of state reimbursement for the attendance of migrant children during regular sessions has improved the situation. Attention should be given to the feasibility of establishing an adult education or vocational program to assist young adult and older migrants in gaining skills which might make it possible for them to gain employment outside of the migrant stream. It is possible, however, that adult education programs might best be conducted in home base areas. The committee is of the opinion that education offers the greatest opportunity to improve the lot of the migrant and his family.

Transportation. Transportation seems to be less of a problem than in former years, as more families are traveling by car, and few trucks were observed to be in unsafe condition. Perhaps the biggest problem is the overloading of vehicles used to take workers to and from the fields.

Welfare. Some counties with limited welfare budgets find it difficult to provide occasional emergency assistance for migrant workers and their families, and the amount of this aid provided was less in 1961 and 1962 than in the preceding two years.

Other Matters. A detailed discussion of other subjects with which the committee has been concerned will be found on pp. 195-221 of the research report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee is concerned over the inadequacy of migrant housing in certain parts of the state and recommends that the state department of health expand its inspection of sanitary facilities and water supplies at migrant housing facilities. (Generally, these inspections have been made only upon complaint.) Further, the committee recommends that the health department initiate an education program to assist the sponsors of migrant labor camps in improving their facilities.

2) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee commends the state employment department for its migrant housing inspection program initiated in 1962 and recommends that this program be continued on an annual basis. The committee recommends further that the department refuse to refer seasonal farm workers to growers whose housing either does not meet the department's standards or who do not correct the housing deficiencies reported to them by the department.

3) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee recognizes the efforts made by the state employment department to find continuous employment for seasonal farm workers. The committee recommends that the department: a) expand its participation in and the implementation of the Annual Worker Plan; b) take all possible steps to recruit local workers and interstate migrants to the fullest extent possible; and c) expand its efforts in the effective utilization and reallocation of interstate seasonal farm workers.

4) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee commends the state education department and local school districts for the successful operation of the migrant summer school program and recommends that this program be expanded into other areas where the concentration of seasonal farm labor indicates such programs would be desirable.

5) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee recommends that House Bill 62 (1960), which requires labor contractors and crew leaders who are employers to keep payroll records and provide workers with withholding statements, be amended to require the registration of labor contractors and crew leaders coming under the provisions of the act.

FOCUSING ON THE PROBLEM

Importance of Migrant Workers

Each year a large number of seasonal farm workers are needed in Colorado, not only at harvest time, but throughout the growing season as well. Only a small proportion of seasonal farm labor needs is met by local workers, especially during peak harvest periods. Consequently, seasonal farm workers from other states play an important role in Colorado's agricultural production. It is virtually impossible to determine accurately the total number of different workers from other states who come to Colorado during the course of a growing season; it is estimated, however, that at least 15,000 different interstate workers are employed during a normal crop year in this state.[1]

Colorado ranks 12th among all states in the number of interstate migrant farm workers who are employed during the growing season.[2] Among the Rocky Mountain and west coast states, Colorado ranks fourth in the number of interstate workers employed.[3]

The size of the total seasonal farm labor force (local workers, intrastate workers, interstate workers, and Mexican nationals) has remained fairly constant in recent years, but the number of interstate workers has been declining. There has been a sharp decline in the past 15 years in both the total number of seasonal farm workers employed and in the number of interstate migrants. Mechanization, technological change, and a reduction in acreage in some of the crops requiring seasonal farm labor have been responsible for the decrease in the size of the seasonal labor force required. Even with this reduction, crops requiring seasonal farm workers are very important in Colorado's agricultural economy.

Legislative Concern

There has been a continuing legislative interest in the problems of the migrant worker and his family, especially since the completion of the 1950-51 Colorado migrant study made by a committee appointed by Governor Lee Knous.[4] This interest has been shown by legislation aimed at helping migrants proposed at several sessions of the General Assembly and the passage by the General Assembly of two measures, one in 1960 to require labor contractors and crew leaders to keep payroll records and provide wage statements to workers in their

---

1. The Seasonal Agricultural Labor Market in Colorado, John Gore, Doctor's Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1962, p. 135.
2. Based on Farm Labor Market Developments, Employment and Wage Supplement, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, published monthly.
3. Ibid.
4. For a discussion of the 1950-1951 study, see Migratory Labor in Colorado, A Progress Report, Colorado Legislative Council, Research Publication No. 43, December 1960, pp. 2 through 5.

employ, and the other in 1961, which provided state financial support for special migrant summer school programs and reimbursement to school districts for migrants enrolled during regular school terms.

1960 Legislative Study

The general lack of information concerning the seasonal farm worker, his problems, and his relationship to the agricultural economy has made it difficult for the General Assembly to evaluate the various legislative proposals relating to migrant workers. To obtain detailed information, the Forty-second General Assembly in 1960 directed the Legislative Council to conduct a study of the problems of migrant laborers and their families.[5] In making this study, the Council was directed to give consideration to the following:[6]

1) coordination of the efforts of state and other public agencies and state-wide and local charitable, ethnic, and religious organizations in attempting solutions to the problems of migrant farm workers;

2) cooperation between federal and state agencies to facilitate the recruitment, transportation, and placement of migratory farm workers;

3) economic problems affecting migratory farm workers;

4) community cooperation in providing social services to such workers; and

5) schooling available to the children of migrant families.

The 1960 Council Committee on Migrant Labor began its study by reviewing the developments in programs for migratory workers and their families, as well as in employment, wages, and working conditions; housing and sanitation; welfare; and education since the 1950-1951 Governor's Committee study. State agency officials concerned with programs and services involving migrant workers and their families met with the committee to explain these programs and indicate further needs. These agencies included: Department of Education, Department of Employment, Department of Health, Department of Welfare, Industrial Commission, and State Patrol.

The subjects on which the committee concentrated during its first year of study consisted of the following:

1) Employment and Wage Rates--recruitment by the Department of Employment, number of migrants and crops for which employed, and wage rates paid.

---

[5] Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, Forty-second General Assembly (1960).

[6] Ibid.

2) Bracero Program--number and proportion of Mexican nationals used and crops for which employed, effect of braceros on the state's agricultural economy, and comparison of wages and standards for braceros and domestic migrants.

3) Education--present summer school program and future needs, interstate cooperation, results of Department of Education research project, financing school needs, regular school attendance, and adult education.

4) Housing, Health and Sanitation--Department of Health projects, housing and sanitation conditions and standards, and statutory and regulatory authority.

5) Transportation--present conditions, Interstate Commerce Commission regulations, and enforcement

6) Welfare--welfare needs and programs and financing welfare services.

7) Minimum Wage Legislation--need and feasibility, interstate relationships, and piece-rate conversion.

8) Unemployment Compensation--administrative problems, interstate relationships, and feasibility.

9) Workmen's Compensation and Occupational Disease Coverage--feasibility, administrative problems, and expense.

10) Licensing and Regulation of Contractors and Crew Leaders--experience and problems under House Bill 62 (1960), and further needs.

The background information on these subjects compiled by the 1960 committee assisted in the definition of problem areas and provided the basis for further study and consideration.

In its report to the General Assembly, the 1960 Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee made the following statement:[7]

> A realistic appraisal of migratory labor problems and a proper evaluation of proposals for improvement cannot be made without first-hand knowledge concerning the migrant and the conditions under which he and his family live and work. For this reason, the committee proposes that a comprehensive field study be made as the next step in its study program. This field study . . . /should/ be coordinated

---

[7] Migratory Labor In Colorado, op. cit., p. 35.

with a series of committee regional meetings in the five areas of the state where the greatest number of migratory workers are employed: Northern Colorado, Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Slope, and San Juan Basin.

The 1960 committee recommended in its report that the field study to be conducted by the Council staff should include: 1) examination of housing facilities for migrants; 2) observation of public agency programs for migrants, with special emphasis on employment department field operations; 3) interviews with a representative sample of migratory farm workers to cover such things as cultural background, residence, education, work skills, type and place of agricultural work, and economics of migratory existence; and 4) interviews with a representative sample of growers, community leaders, labor contractors, crew leaders, and processors.[8]

Present Legislative Study

House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) directed the Legislative Council to continue the study of migratory farm labor which had been started by a Legislative Council Committee in 1960. In authorizing the continuation of this study, House Joint Resolution No. 10 specified that the following subjects be included:

1) coordination of efforts by public agencies and statewide and local organizations in trying to solve the problems of migrant farm workers and their families;

2) cooperation between federal and state agencies to facilitate the recruitment, transportation, and placement of migrant farm workers;

3) economic problems of migrant farm workers;

4) community cooperation in providing social servies for migrants;

5) migrant school programs; and

6) such other problems as may come within the purview of this study.

At its initial meeting on May 10, 1961, the members of the present Migrant Labor Committee agreed that an extensive field study was needed to develop as complete a picture as possible of the migrant farm worker and his problems in Colorado. The committee also decided to hold a series of regional meetings in conjunction with the field study and, in connection with these meetings, to tour migrant housing facilities and to observe migrant schools and other agency and community programs for migrants, whenever possible. The committee directed the staff to follow generally the recommendations of the 1960 committee as to the content of the field study, and the committee devoted considerable time to review and revision of a proposed questionnaire for migrant workers. In making the field study the committee authorized the staff to employ a Spanish and a Navajo interpreter and to seek the cooperation of public agency personnel concerned with migrants.

---

[8] Ibid.

Because of the wide scope of the study, the amount of field work involved, and the overlap among areas in the peak employment of migratory farm workers, the committee determined that it would take the full two years provided in House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) to complete the study. During the first year, it was decided that the committee would cover the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Palisade area, and San Juan Basin. During the second year, attention would be focused on Northern Colorado, where the largest number of migrants are employed for an extended period.

Committee Meetings

During 1961 and 1962 the committee held nine regional public hearings. Public hearings were held as follows:

Arkansas Valley -- Rocky Ford and Lamar, June 5 and 6, 1961
San Luis Valley -- Alamosa and Monte Vista, July 19 and 20, 1961
Western Slope -- Palisade, August 18, 1961
San Juan Basin -- Cortez, August 21, 1961
Northern Colorado -- Brush, June 1, 1962
Ft. Lupton, July 19, 1962
Greeley, August 10, 1962

Invited to meet with the committee at these hearings were: growers, processors, labor contractors, legislators from the area, federal officials (Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Bureau of Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), state officials (departments of education, employment, health, and welfare, the Colorado highway patrol, and the Industrial Commission), local officials (education, health, welfare, sheriffs, police chiefs, mayors, county commissioners, and councilmen), community leaders, and interested citizens.

Prior to each series of regional meetings, the Council staff made a preliminary study of the area to compile background data for the committee and to develop a list of those who might be interested in meeting with the committee. Each person on the list received a personal invitation to attend from the chairman on behalf of the committee, and information concerning the meeting and inviting all citizens to attend was sent to all newspapers and radio and television stations in the area. Approximately 550 people attended the public hearings: Rocky Ford, 60; Lamar, 30; Alamosa, 35; Monte Vista, 50; Palisade, 75; Cortez, 30; Brush, 75; Ft. Lupton, 150; and Greeley, 50.

Committee Tours

In connection with the Arkansas Valley meetings, the committee made two tours of migrant housing, one in the Rocky Ford-Manzanola-Swink area and the other in the Lamar-Granada area. The committee also spent one morning at the Rocky Ford school for migrant children. The committee examined housing facilities around Alamosa and Monte Vista, observed workers in the field during lettuce harvest, visited a lettuce packaging plant, and spent some time at the Monte Vista school for migrant children. At Palisade, the housing tour included both the Palisade camp and on-the-farm housing and a visit was made to two peach and pear packing plants. The committee also spent some time at the Palisade migrant school. At the time of the Cortez meeting, there were few migrants in the area, so the committee visited two pinto bean packaging plants and the migrant housing there and traveled to the Navajo reservation to observe how Navajo migratory workers live at home. The committee visited the Wiggins school and examined housing in the area prior to the Brush meeting. The Fort Lupton meeting was preceded by a tour of the Fort Lupton migratory labor camp. Following the meeting, the committee visited the Platteville school. Several potato packing sheds and a cucumber processing plant were visited in connection with the Greeley meeting.

Topics Discussed at Regional Meetings

The same major topics were covered at each regional meetings, although there was some difference in the questions asked by the committee because of situations and problems which varied from area to area. In general, the following major topics were covered at each meeting:

1) number of seasonal farm workers employed, during what periods and for what crops;

2) composition of the seasonal farm labor force and the sources of supply for such labor;

3) reasons for decrease in the number of interstate and intrastate migrants and the utilization of local labor for seasonal farm work;

4) employment of Mexican nationals;

5) relationship of processors, growers, growers' organizations, labor contractors, and the state employment service in the recruitment and utilization of seasonal farm labor;

6) agricultural marketing problems, extent of mechanization and technological improvements, need for further mechanization and technological improvement, availability of and need for packing and processing plants;

7) availability and adequacy of housing for seasonal farm workers;

8) migrant health and sanitation programs and needs;

9) migrant school programs and education needs;

10) law enforcement problems related to the migrant farm worker; and

11) community programs for and attitudes toward the migrant farm worker and his family.

Field Study

Interviews were completed with 706 migratory workers in 1961 and with 225 migratory workers in 1962. The 1961 interviews covered the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Slope, and San Juan Basin. The interviews in 1962 covered the following areas in Northern Colorado: 1) Morgan and Logan counties; 2) Ft. Lupton, Brighton, and Longmont; 3) Loveland and Fort Collins; and 4) the remainder of Weld County.

Six hundred and twenty-five of these interviews were made with family heads or other family members, so that information was obtained concerning other members in the family group. Consequently, the 931 completed interviews covered 3,219 people, of whom 1,811 were employed as farm laborers. An analysis of the number of migrants interviewed, location of interviews, and related information is shown in Tables 1 through 3.

Migrant Interviews. The migrants who were interviewed were asked questions concerning the following: 1) age and place of residence; 2) number of years as a farm laborer and number of years as a farm laborer in Colorado; 3) crop activity in which employed and other crops in the area in which worker expects to be employed; 4) area or state where employed prior to present employment and expected location of next employment if different from present; 5) attitudes toward working in Colorado and toward employers and communities; 6) how present employment was obtained; 7) present rate of pay and amount made by worker and family during past week and since April 1 of this year; 8) number of days employed during past month and reasons for days of non-work; 9) place in which last winter was spent, employment during the winter and amount earned; 10) comparison of home base or winter housing and present migrant housing; 11) family status, number and age of children, if employed or in school; 12) health status of worker and his family; and 13) financial status of worker and his family, expenditure for food, transportation, and other goods and services.

Other Aspects of Field Work. In addition to the completed migrant questionnaires, the field work included interviews with a representative number of growers, processors, labor contractors, growers' association officers, state and local officials, community leaders, and law enforcement officers. The subjects discussed during these interviews generally followed the topics covered at the committee's regional hearings, with the questions asked designed to develop more specific and detailed information.

More than 100 growers were interviewed. These growers were asked about their labor and marketing problems, labor utilization, mechanization, crop acreage, and recommendations concerning seasonal farm labor. Considerable time was spent with the growers, examining fields and observing crews at work.

TABLE 1

Number and Location
of Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962

	Arkansas Valley	San Luis Valley[a]	San Luis Valley[b]	Palisade Area	San Juan Basin	Northern Colorado	Total
Total Interviews	100	104	149	312	41	225	931
Anglo	0	1	0	105	0	0	106
Spanish-American	100	72	96	58	0	225	551
Negro	0	4	3	125	0	0	132
Indian	0	0	50	24	41	0	115
Other[c]	0	27	0	0	0	0	27
Family Groups	78	76	85	151	34	200	624
Single Workers	22	28	64	161	7	25	307

---

a. Early season, July-August.
b. Late season, September-October.
c. American citizens of Filipino extraction, who are custom lettuce workers.

TABLE 2

Number of People Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962

	Arkansas Valley	San Luis Valley[a]	San Luis Valley[b]	Palisade Area	San Juan Basin	Northern Colorado	Total
Total People Covered	496	320	447	541	101	1,314	3,219
Anglo	0	6	0	198	0	0	204
Spanish-American	496	272	343	143	0	1,314	2,568
Negro	0	6	3	167	0	0	176
Indian	0	0	101	33	101	0	235
Other[c]	0	36	0	0	0	0	36

---

a. Early season, July-August.
b. Late season, September-October.
c. American citizens of Filipino extraction.

TABLE 3

Number of Farm Workers
Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962

	Arkansas Valley	San Luis Valley[a]	San Luis Valley[b]	Palisade Area	San Juan Basin	Northern Colorado	Total
Total Workers	240	151	277	422	70	651	1,811
Anglo	0	3	0	144	0	0	147
Spanish-American	240	115	203	94	0	651	1,303
Negro	0	4	3	157	0	0	164
Indian	0	0	71	27	70	0	168
Other[c]	0	29	0	0	0	0	29
Males Over 16	138	113	160	341	37	280	1,069
Anglo	0	3	0	107	0	0	110
Spanish-American	138	79	108	64	0	280	669
Negro	0	4	3	145	0	0	152
Indian	0	0	49	25	37	0	111
Other[c]	0	27	0	0	0	0	27
Females Over 16	71	19	73	56	30	225	474
Anglo	0	0	0	28	0	0	28
Spanish-American	71	19	52	21	0	225	388
Negro	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
Indian	0	0	21	2	30	0	53
Other[c]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children Under 16	31	19	44	25	3	146	268
Anglo	0	0	0	9	0	0	9
Spanish-American	31	17	43	9	0	146	246
Negro	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
Indian	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
Other[c]	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

---

a. Early season, July-August.
b. Late season, September-October.
c. American citizens of Filipino extraction.

Extensive interviews were made with processors and officials of growers' associations. Included in these interviews were: Western Canning Company, American Crystal Sugar Company, National Sugar Company, Holly Sugar Company, Divon Packing Company, Empire Field Crops (where the staff had the opportunity to attend a board meeting), San Luis Valley Growers Association, the Peach Board of Control, Great Western Sugar Company, Kuner-Empson, and the Fort Lupton Canning Company.

There were several reasons why the number of growers and processors interviewed was much smaller than the number of migrants:

1) The committee's public hearings were held for the purpose of meeting with growers, processors, public officials, and community leaders, so a much larger number of growers and processors were contacted by the committee than those interviewed by the staff.

2) The growers interviewed by the staff were selected because of crop activity, location, and amount of labor employed; generally, they were among the largest employers of seasonal farm labor in a given area.

3) The interviews with growers and processors took considerably longer than those with migrants. The average time per interview with growers and processors was two hours, and some took much longer.

Considerable time was spent in observing and examining local programs and services for migrants, such as the migrant nurse program, the work of the migrant ministry, school programs, and the employment department farm labor field service. Housing and sanitation facilities were examined, as were some of the vehicles used to transport migrant workers, and visits were made to agricultural experiment stations.

The field staff interviewed migrants either in the evening or on days when they were not working, so as not to interfere with agricultural activities. The other interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the interviewees.

Area Differences

The five areas (Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Colorado, San Juan Basin and Northern Colorado) covered by the committee during the study differ to a considerable degree in many respects such as: 1) size and composition of the seasonal farm labor force; 2) crop activity and peak periods of labor utilization; 3) organization of the farm labor force and wage scales; 4) use of Mexican nationals; 5) public and private programs and services for migrants; and 6) community attitudes toward migrant workers. There are considerable variations within some areas as well.

These differences are discussed at length in the following five chapters, each of which presents a picture of the migrant labor situation and related matters in one of the five areas requiring a large number of seasonal farm workers.

ARKANSAS VALLEY

Crop Activities and Acreage

Crops Using Seasonal Farm Labor

The Arkansas Valley area covered in the migrant labor study includes: Baca, Bent, Crowley, Otero and Prowers counties. The major crops for which seasonal farm labor is employed are sugar beets and onions; in Baca County broomcorn is the chief crop requiring seasonal farm workers. Other crops for which seasonal labor is used are melons, tomatoes, and cucumbers.

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet acreage and production in the Arkansas Valley in 1961 are shown in Table 4. Otero County had the largest sugar beet acreage, more than 7,000 acres or almost 45 per cent of the total in the five counties; Prowers County accounted for slightly more than one-fourth of the five-county total. The average yield for the five counties was 12.3 tons per acre, compared with the state average of 14.7 tons per acre. This average per acre yield was considerably lower than the 15.7 ton per acre average in 1960; the 1960 state average per acre yield was 17.8 tons. These five Arkansas Valley counties accounted for almost 10 per cent of the total state sugar beet acreage and eight per cent of total state production.

TABLE 4

Sugar Beets Acreage and Production
Arkansas Valley, 1961 [a]

County	Acres Planted	Per cent Harvested	Acres Harvested	Tons Per Acre	Production Tons
Baca	1,406	99%	1,389	15.9	22,043
Bent	1,951	100	1,949	12.0	23,437
Crowley	1,949	90	1,755	9.2	16,164
Otero	7,006	98	6,842	12.7	87,103
Prowers	4,325	93	4,008	11.9	47,661
Total	16,637	96%	15,943	12.3	196,408

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary. Colorado Department of Agriculture in Cooperation with U.S. Dept. of Agriculture.

Broomcorn. Only two Arkansas Valley counties have any broomcorn acreage, and one of these (Prowers County) has only 350 acres. Baca County accounts for almost 98 per cent of the state's broomcorn acreage and production. This information is shown in Table 5 on the following page.

TABLE 5

Broomcorn Acreage and Production
Arkansas Valley, 1960[a]

County	Acres Planted	Per Cent Harvested	Acres Harvested	Pounds Per Acre	Production Tons
Baca	46,670	92%	42,770	240	5,156
Prowers	350	91	320	210	34
Total	47,020	91.6%	43,090	240	5,190

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960.

Other Crops. Onions, tomatoes, cantaloupe, potatoes, and cucumbers (in that order) all require significant numbers of seasonal farm workers. Otero County has the greatest acreage among the five counties for all of these crops, with two-thirds of the cantaloupe and onion acreage, slightly more than three-fourths of the tomato acreage, and all except eight acres in cucumbers. Over-all, almost 57 per cent of the state's cantaloupe acreage is planted in four Arkansas Valley counties (Bent, Crowley, Otero, Prowers). These counties plus Baca have 45 per cent of the state's onion acreage. The tomato acreage in these counties (Baca excepted) constitutes 50 per cent of the state total. Cucumber acreage in Otero and Bent counties is 11 per cent of the state total, while potato acreage is less than one per cent of the state total. The most recent acreage totals for these crops are shown by county in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Cantaloupe and Vegetable Acreage
Arkansas Valley, 1960[a]

County	Cantaloupes	Onions	Tomatoes[b]	Potatoes	Cucumbers
Baca	--	200	--	30	--
Bent	390	710	51	90	8
Crowley	100	120	373	--	--
Otero	1,000	2,500	1,524	350	316
Prowers	100	300	31	100	--
Total	1,590	3,830	1,979	470	324

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960.
b. Totals for 1959 taken from 1959 Federal Census.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

Sugar Beets. There has been a 12 per cent increase in sugar beet acreage in the Arkansas Valley in the past 10 years. This rate of increase was only slightly less than that for the state as a whole. Production, however, increased substantially during the same period (57 per cent), so that the valley's proportion of total state production increased from 6.5 to eight per cent. This over-all production increase is reflected in the change in the yield per acre. In 1951, the average yield in the five Arkansas Valley counties was 10.4 tons per acre, only two-thirds of the state average, as compared with 12.3 tons per acre in 1961.

Only three of the five counties increased their sugar beet acreage during the 10-year period. Otero's acreage increased from 5,172 to 7,006; Baca from none to slightly more than 1,400; and Bent from 864 to 1,951. Prowers County's sugar beet acreage decreased from 5,206 to 4,325, and Crowley County's decreased from 2,739 to 1,949. The average yield per acre increased in all five counties.

Broomcorn. Even though Baca County accounts for 98 per cent of the state's broomcorn acreage, the number of acres devoted to this crop has decreased substantially in the past 10 years. The 1960 acreage was only two-thirds of that in 1950, although production increased from 190 to 240 pounds per acre. The decrease in broomcorn acreage in Prowers County was even greater, from 3,080 acres in 1950 to 350 acres in 1960.

Other Crops. There was little change in potato and cucumber acreage in the Arkansas Valley between 1950 and 1960. Onion acreage decreased from 5,000 to 3,830, with almost all of the decrease in Otero and Prowers counties. There was a similar decrease in the state as a whole, so the five Arkansas Valley counties accounted for approximately the same proportion of total state acreage in 1960 as they did in 1950. Two crops showed increased acreage during the 10-year period, cantaloupes and tomatoes. Cantaloupe acreage increased by a third (from 1,190 to 1,590 acres). Otero and Bent counties accounted for the increase, while Crowley and Prowers counties had a slight decrease. Tomato acreage increased 19 per cent in the Arkansas Valley from 1950 to 1960, while in all counties, except Otero, there was a decrease. Tomato acreage in Otero County increased from 900 to 1,524 acres, or 69 per cent.

Number of Farms and Average Size. The changing nature of agricultural organization and activity in the Arkansas Valley during the past 10 to 15 years may be illustrated by the decrease in the number of farms and the increase in average (median) farm size, even though the data available apply to all farms and ranches and not those with crops requiring a significant amount of seasonal farm labor. Between 1950 and 1960, the number of farms in the five Arkansas Valley counties decreased by 28 per cent. Prowers County had the greatest decrease (32 per cent) and Baca County the least (21.6 per cent). During the same period, the median farm size in the five counties increased almost 45 per cent. The greatest increase was in Crowley County, from 153 to 243 acres (almost 59 per cent), and the smallest increase in Prowers County, from 307 to 418 acres (36 per cent). Table 7 shows the 1950 and 1960 comparisons in number of farms and farm size for the five counties.

TABLE 7

Number of Farms and Median Size, Arkansas Valley, 1950 and 1960[a]

	Number of Farms			Median Farm Size (In Acres)		
County	1950	1960	Pct. of Change	1950	1960	Pct. of Change
Baca	999	783	-21.6%	792	1,102	39.1%
Bent	638	439	-31.2	224	328	46.4
Crowley	490	348	-29.0	153	243	58.8
Otero	1,030	755	-26.7	91	132	45.1
Prowers	1,126	763	-32.2	307	418	36.2
Total	4,283	3,088	-28.0%	338	489	44.7%

a. Federal Census Data

Mechanization and Technological Change

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet harvest in the Arkansas Valley is completely mechanized which is also true in other major sugar producing areas in the state. Mechanization and technological change have been slow to come, however, in pre-harvest activities. Only 50 per cent of the sugar beet acreage is planted in monogerm seed or its equivalent. There is very little mechanical blocking and thinning of sugar beets, and almost all hand labor is performed with short-handled hoes, even on that acreage planted in monogerm seed.

Several of the growers who were interviewed by the field staff or who spoke at the Migrant Labor Committee's regional hearings in Rocky Ford and Lamar contended that they did not use monogerm seed or mechanical blocking and thinning because they anticipated less yield per acre from such practices.

Officials of both the American Crystal Sugar Company and the National Sugar Company stated that they have been quite unsuccessful in encouraging their growers to mechanize their pre-harvest activities in sugar beets. Both companies have machinery and indicated that they were willing to rent it or make it available free of charge, but that the growers were not interested. The two sugar companies have had more success in promoting the use of monogerm seed, although there were few indications that acceptance was widespread during the 1961 field study.

One sugar company official was of the opinion that the diversified agricultural base of most of his company's beet growers was the major reason why they (the growers) were reluctant to mechanize. With a number of crops requiring seasonal hand labor, it is easier to keep workers constantly employed, and the sugar companies assist by recruiting labor, which is also used on other crops besides beets. This official added that the mechanization of sugar beets would reduce the supply of labor to the point where growers would have to consider mechanization and technological improvement in onions and other crops; he didn't think they were ready to do so at this time.

This point of view was confirmed by several growers who said that there was no need to mechanize pre-harvest activities in sugar beets as long as there is an adequate supply of domestic and Mexican labor. If the supply diminished, or if the bracero program was terminated, some of them indicated they would mechanize, while others said they would turn to other crops. Almost all of the growers surveyed (who had both sugar beet and onion acreage) used the same workers for pre-harvest activities in both crops, if at all possible.

On the other hand, a few growers indicated the need for mechanization and were experimenting with mechanical blocking and thinning. One grower said that such mechanization was the only alternative if Mexican nationals were no longer available and added that elimination of the bracero program would improve the grower's position in the long run (a viewpoint shared by only a very small number of the growers interviewed).

Onions. At the time of the field survey, very few growers were harvesting onions mechanically, and for those that were, mechanical harvesting was still in the experimental stage. A number of growers stated that soil conditions and the type of onions grown were not conducive to mechanical harvest operations. Others had reservations but were willing to try harvesting onions mechanically because of the high cost of hand labor for this operation. Only a few growers were trying pelletized onion seed in order to reduce the amount of hand thinning necessary. None of them reported satisfaction as yet with the results.

Other Crops. Hand labor is used extensively for other stoop crops such as melons, cucumbers, potatoes, and tomatoes. It is possible to pick tomatoes mechanically, but as yet a variety suitable for growing in the Arkansas Valley has not been developed which can be adapted to mechanical harvest. Further research on this problem is underway at Colorado State University.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

Generally, Arkansas Valley growers feel that they are caught in a cost-price squeeze over which they have no control. A number of them cited the increased costs of machinery, supplies, and labor as contrasted with the prices received for their products. Several stated that past joint efforts to establish production and quality controls (in such crops as onions, for example) have not been successful, and there is a difference of opinion as to whether such efforts could be successful in the future. The growers recognize the trend in their area toward fewer and larger farms, and a number expressed the fear that they would be forced to go out of business, either because of the cost-price relationship or through an insufficient supply of seasonal farm labor. These concerns of the growers help to explain their attitudes toward seasonal farm labor. There is a reluctance to increase the wage scale, although a number of growers indicated they would do so if it were economically feasible. One grower expressed concern over the $.75 an hour wage rate with the comment that if he pays his workers $.75 an hour, his own labor is only worth that much.

By and large, local workers were considered undependable, and domestic migrants also have been considered unsatisfactory by some growers, because of their refusal to work in certain crop activities, such as tomato and cucumber harvests and their freedom to pick and choose employment or not work at all, even though a crop might be lost if not harvested when ready. For this reason, there is general support of the bracero program. This program provides an assured source of steady, hard-working labor, and if the Mexican nationals won't work or don't perform satisfactorily they can be sent home and replaced. The continuation of the bracero program is considered especially desirable by some growers who are reluctant to mechanize under present economic conditions.

On the other hand, there are some growers who dislike using Mexican nationals and prefer domestic labor. A number of these growers have been able to attract and keep the same local and domestic workers over a number of years and have found them hard-working and reliable.

Two growers said that they would like to use domestic workers if they could employ them on a contract basis similar to that for Mexican nationals. Otherwise, experience has shown that they could be caught short during critical harvest and pre-harvest periods.

Many of the growers have not shown any great interest in migrant workers other than in their work performance, although a number have cooperated in the establishment and operation of the Rocky Ford migrant school and have tried to improve housing conditions. Empire Field Crops, the major growers' organization in the valley, has been working with its members in this respect.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers - Peak Employment Periods

There is not much employment of seasonal farm labor in the Arkansas Valley until about the second week in May. The number employed increases steadily until the early season peak in the latter part of June. From the end of June until the end of August, there is a gradual decrease. There is a rather rapid increase in employment during the first two weeks in September, with the late season peak in the latter part of the month. Although there are fewer than in May, June, and September, there are still some interstate migrants and Mexican nationals employed in the Arkansas Valley during October.

The major early peak period of agricultural activity includes: sugar beets, blocking and thinning, and hoeing and weeding; onion seeding and pre-harvest; irrigation; and some pre-harvest work in tomatoes, melons, and vegetables. The small grain harvest accounts for about half of the farm employment in the Lamar area during June. Major late season agricultural activities are the broomcorn harvest in the Lamar area and the onion and tomato harvests, primarily around Rocky Ford and La Junta.

Employment department estimates of the number of seasonal farm workers are made each week during the growing season by the area offices. There are three area offices in the Arkansas Valley: Rocky Ford (Crowley County and the western two-thirds of Otero County); La Junta (the eastern one-third of Otero County and the western three-fourths of Bent County); and Lamar (the remainder of Bent County and Baca and Prowers counties).

Generally, less than 25 per cent of the seasonal farm labor in the Arkansas Valley has been performed by local workers during the past three years, although there is considerable variance among the areas. In the La Junta area, local labor accounted for only 15 per cent of seasonal farm employment through the 1960-1962 growing seasons; in the Rocky Ford area, almost 23 per cent, and in the Lamar area, almost 25 per cent.

Mexican nationals have made up 35 per cent of the seasonal farm labor employed during the past three years. Relatively few Mexican nationals were employed in the Lamar area (about 10 per cent of the total seasonal labor force). In the Rocky Ford area, almost 40 per cent of the seasonal farm workers were Mexican nationals, and in La Junta, 55 per cent.

Slightly more than 30 per cent of the seasonal farm workers employed in the Arkansas Valley during the past three years have been interstate migrants. Interstate workers constituted 21 per cent of the work force in the La Junta area, almost 30 per cent in the Rocky Ford area, and 52 per cent in the Lamar area. Less than 10 per cent of seasonal farm labor needs are supplied by intrastate workers.

Table 8 shows the employment of seasonal farm workers in the Arkansas Valley by area for selected weeks, 1960 through 1962.

Employment Department Statistics. Table 8, as indicated, is based on the weekly reports of seasonal farm labor by the employment department area offices. Department officials admit that these statistics are good estimates at best. It is possible that at least some of those workers employed by private labor contractors may not have been counted from time to time, because many of these contractor crews are moved constantly around the valley, from Pueblo across the Kansas line. (For example, the largest contractor in the area estimated that there were 1,000 interstate migrants in the valley during a week when employment department reports showed a total of 510.)[1]

There is no way, however, to determine the per cent of error in the employment department estimates, if error exists, and these statistics are the most reliable available.

---

[1] In an interview with an Industrial Commission staff member. Field staff observations of the number of workers employed in a specific area also differed on occasion from the number reported by the employment department area officer.

TABLE 8

Employment of Seasonal Farm Workers
In the Arkansas Valley By Area
for Selected Weeks and Principal Crop Activities, 1960-1962[a]

Month and Week	La Junta 1960	La Junta 1961	La Junta 1962	Rocky Ford 1960	Rocky Ford 1961	Rocky Ford 1962	Lamar 1960	Lamar 1961	Lamar 1962	Total 1960	Total 1961	Total 1962
May (2nd week)												
Total workers	406	400	563	455	476	382	142	251	269	1,003	1,127	1,216
Mexican nationals	271	196	160	149	196	62	20	28	9	440	420	231
Locals	105	57	30	119	120	105	100	161	147	324	338	282
Intrastate	---	39	---	---	10	20	---	50	6	---	99	26
Interstate	30	108	375	187	150	195	22	12	107	239	270	677
Crops												
Sugar Beets	13	---	351	152	238	213	---	46	84	165	284	648
Onions	393	400	214	263	216	146	27	52	25	683	668	385
May (4th week)												
Total workers	571	631	559	856	718	702	484	567	555	1,911	1,916	1,816
Mexican nationals	340	324	244	276	193	166	33	40	44	649	557	454
Locals	80	79	100	202	140	120	142	154	142	424	373	362
Intrastate	75	40	---	---	30	75	18	59	20	93	129	95
Interstate	76	188	215	378	355	341	291	314	349	745	857	905
Crops												
Sugar Beets	287	280	334	560	314	550	104	343	352	951	937	1,236
Onions	199	329	239	130	273	80	205	47	28	534	649	347
June (3rd week)												
Total workers	546	639	423	844	785	518	495	445	715	1,885	1,869	1,656
Mexican nationals	353	352	207	267	274	188	43	47	72	663	673	467
Locals	78	98	115	151	135	100	110	161	150	339	394	365
Intrastate	30	49	20	15	35	30	15	35	95	60	119	145
Interstate	85	140	81	411	341	200	327	202	398	823	683	679
Crops												
Sugar Beets	306	268	208	483	343	310	240	200	330	1,029	811	848
Onions	179	304	114	246	282	94	50	77	65	475	663	273

TABLE 8
(Continued)

Month and Week	La Junta			Rocky Ford			Lamar			Total		
	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962
July (3rd week)												
Total workers	519	441	416	471	530	374	335	421	398	1,325	1,392	1,188
Mexican nationals	263	265	211	179	210	133	32	36	50	474	511	394
Locals	107	61	75	162	160	160	110	124	130	379	345	365
Intrastate	91	26	45	---	20	41	10	27	33	101	73	119
Interstate	58	89	85	130	140	40	183	234	185	371	463	310
Crops												
Sugar Beets	94	---	95	76	91	95	80	140	197	250	231	292
Onions	259	70	145	187	200	110	80	40	63	526	297	318
Other veg.	112	248	179	120	196	141	---	---	---	232	444	320
August (4th week)												
Total workers	494	666	674	496	598	715	286	287	288	1,276	1,551	1,677
Mexican nationals	294	374	284	238	298	347	32	32	50	564	704	681
Locals	103	115	108	163	170	190	109	118	114	375	403	412
Intrastate	34	92	95	---	40	45	13	28	20	47	160	160
Interstate	63	85	187	95	90	133	132	109	104	290	284	424
Crops												
Onions	273	443	367	200	321	340	25	---	23	498	764	730
Melons	105	45	56	111	120	41	26	32	27	242	197	124
Other veg.	85	217	85	159	161	304	---	---	---	244	378	389
Sept. (3rd week)												
Total workers	619	649	555	640	500	595	1,049	1,164	1,070	2,308	2,313	2,220
Mexican nationals	380	402	320	360	355	395	32	235	50	772	992	765
Locals	79	53	85	165	100	125	125	152	138	369	305	348
Intrastate	70	64	50	---	10	10	253	218	250	323	292	310
Interstate	90	130	100	115	35	65	639	559	632	844	724	797
Crops												
Broomcorn	---	---	---	---	---	---	803	940	760	803	940	760
Onions	307	253	238	195	157	215	86	55	119	688	465	572
Other veg.	253	277	219	308	303	277	---	---	---	561	580	496

TABLE 8
(Continued)

Month and Week	La Junta 1960	La Junta 1961	La Junta 1962	Rocky Ford 1960	Rocky Ford 1961	Rocky Ford 1962	Lamar 1960	Lamar 1961	Lamar 1962	Total 1960	Total 1961	Total 1962
October (1st week)												
Total workers	586	519	353	590	349	492	386	807	1,141	1,562	1,725	1,986
Mexican nationals	380	341	256	330	233	334	24	234	50	734	808	640
Locals	64	66	52	130	100	120	120	131	138	314	297	290
Intrastate	47	53	25	---	---	18	48	134	245	95	187	308
Interstate	95	109	20	130	16	20	194	308	708	419	433	748
Crops												
Broomcorn	---	---	---	---	---	---	125	510	860	125	510	860
Onions	283	255	189	282	58	195	76	104	107	669	417	491
Tomatoes	215	150	149	205	116	137	---	---	---	420	266	286

---

a. Taken from State Employment Department Area Office Weekly Reports.

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment

Most of the recruitment of interstate migratory labor in the Arkansas Valley is done by the American Crystal Sugar Company, Dave Nava (a private contractor), and the State Department of Employment. American Crystal recruits approximately 9,000 workers in Texas to supply its growers in a several-state area. The employment department recruits workers in New Mexico, primarily for Empire Field Crops, a growers' organization. In addition to Mr. Nava, there are also a few small labor contractors in the Arkansas Valley. These contractors employ local labor usually and make their own arrangements with growers, although occasionally they may receive referrals from the employment department.

Empire Field Crops. Empire Field Crops' membership is concentrated in an area bounded by Manzanola on the west and Las Animas on the east, although there are several members in the Lamar area. The organization is nine years old and was established primarily to rationalize and organize the seasonal farm labor market, so that growers would be assured, as far as possible, a constant labor supply without having to depend on private contractors. Even though Empire Field Crops is a growers' organization, three processors are members and play an important role in its activities: Western Canning Company, American Crystal Sugar Company, and National Sugar Company.

American Crystal Sugar Co. This company, as indicated above, brings several hundred workers into the Arkansas Valley. Not all of these workers are placed with Empire Field Crop members, because a number of American Crystal's growers, especially in the Fowler area (west of Manzanola), are not members of Empire.

Dave Nava. At one time, Mr. Nava was the prime supplier of labor for the valley. A number of the growers interviewed indicated dissatisfaction with this arrangement because they had no assurance that they would have labor when they needed it, because an independent contractor is free to choose those farms and crop activities which he considers to be the most advantageous. This situation, along with concern over the quality of labor provided, helped lead to the organization of Empire Field Crops.

Even with the establishment and organizational growth of Empire Field Crops, Mr. Nava is still very prominent in the farm labor picture. He still recruits a large number of workers and is able to keep a good proportion of them throughout the growing season.[2] Empire Field Crops, as yet, is unable to provide a sufficient number of workers to meet all peak period needs and emergencies in the area. Therefore, many Empire members make use of Mr. Nava's crews from time to time.

---

2. The migrant interviews conducted in the Arkansas Valley indicated that Mr. Nava's workers usually came earlier and stayed longer than domestics brought in under other auspices, although there appears to be a high annual turnover rate.

Because Empire cannot provide all the labor needed, it is unable to prohibit its members from obtaining labor from other sources. The need for Dave Nava's crews is demonstrated by the fact that a number of growers sublease housing to him free of charge on the condition that he will provide workers when needed.

There are several problems in the recruitment of migratory labor for the Arkansas Valley, aside from the fact that recruitment activities are not coordinated. First, the Arkansas Valley has been a low wage area, as compared with most other areas in Colorado and other states. Consequently, it becomes progressively more difficult to attract workers to the area, and often those that do come will not return for a second year. Second, the available labor supply is considerably less than it was a few years ago. The employment department reports that it is becoming difficult to recruit workers in New Mexico, because they have turned to other types of employment. Colorado recruits in Texas, but must compete with those from a number of midwestern and western states for available labor. Third, the quality of the labor recruited has diminished in the past few years, according to several of the growers with whom this matter was discussed.

Mexican Nationals. The recruitment problems enumerated above, especially the reported difficulty in obtaining labor in Texas and New Mexico, has made the Mexican national an important part of the farm labor picture in the Arkansas Valley. Other reasons cited for the need for Mexican nationals include: 1) domestic workers refuse to pick cucumbers and tomatoes; 2) domestic workers leave the area in early September so as to return to their home state in time for the opening of school; and 3) the general unreliability and unavailability of local labor. Empire Field Crops serves as the sponsoring agency for most of the Mexican nationals brought into the valley. The recruitment fees and transportation costs for most of the braceros brought in are paid by the processing companies. By having Empire Field Crops designated as the official employer of these Mexican nationals, these workers may be employed for any crop activity carried on by Empire's members. If the processors were the official employers, these braceros could work only in those crops in which the processor is concerned.

Ciruli-Grasmick farms (Lamar-Granada area) and the Divon Packing Company (Fowler) sponsor braceros independently and not through Empire Field Crops. Divon has not joined Empire Field Crops because currently it brings in braceros specifically for tomatoes and peas and sees no advantage in belonging to Empire. The failure of the Divon Packing Company to join Empire Field Crops appears to be a major reason why some growers in the Fowler area have not become members. These growers generally have two crops which require seasonal farm labor: sugar beets and tomatoes. Labor for the former is supplied by the American Crystal Sugar Company and for the latter by the Divon Packing Company, so they feel there is no need to join Empire Field Crops.

Labor Utilization and Reallocation

The focal point for Empire Field Crops' labor activity is the Swink camp. This camp is used primarily as a staging area, and the employment department maintains an office there. Usually domestic workers remain at the camp for a short period of time, but there are exceptions. Braceros may remain throughout the six-week contract period.

The initial allocation of domestic workers by Empire Field Crops is usually made by the end of May. The beginning of the contract period for Mexican nationals is usually the second week in May. Following the early season peak (in late June), Empire recontracts braceros and reallocates among its members both braceros and domestic workers. A priority list has been established for this reallocation. At the top of the list are those growers who already have labor. These growers may retain all they need. If growers have sponsored workers,[3] but have lost some, they have second priority. At the bottom of the list are those growers who need additional labor. The only source of labor to be reallocated appears to be the surplus from those growers who do not need all the workers who were in their employ during the peak period.

This reallocation procedure by Empire is an attempt to rationalize the labor market. But it falls short for several reasons: 1) Empire does not control a sufficient number of workers to supply all of its members' needs. 2) It has no control over locals or workers supplied by contractors. 3) American Crystal does not always reallocate workers in accordance with Empire's wishes.

As indicated previously, a number of American Crystal's growers are not members of Empire. Depending on pressures and labor needs, American Crystal may reallocate workers (both braceros and domestics) to non-member growers. Empire objects to this process because it interferes with its efforts to structure the labor market. It appeared from the interview with company officals that American Crystal is not too happy with several aspects of the labor market situation, none of which is necessarily related to Empire Field Crops. American Crystal is dissatisfied because growers often use the workers brought in by American Crystal (both domestic and braceros) for crops other than sugar beets and neglect beet hoeing and thinning. When it is no longer possible to put off this activity, these growers contact American Crystal for additional labor, and then the company has difficulty in finding a sufficient number of workers. American Crystal has no objection to workers' being used for crops other than sugar beets after the beets have been taken care of. Because American Crystal has had considerable difficulty in getting growers in the area to mechanize pre-harvest activities, the acre-worker ratio in the Arkansas Valley is lower than that of any other area in which the company operates.

Employment of Labor Contractor Crews. The Arkansas Valley is usually subjected to rapidly changing weather conditions during the pre-harvest period. Several days of rain will result in the idleness of a large number of workers. The return of clear weather will set off a clamor for labor by growers because of an immediate need for thinning and weeding. The same pattern may also develop during harvest season; weather conditions may delay harvest, and again workers will be idle and may leave the area. When the harvest is ready, a large supply of labor is needed immediately.

---

3. Those provided by processors.

Empire Field Crops cannot meet these peak demands, and neither can the employment department. Many of the growers stated that they no longer contacted the employment department in such circumstances, because either it could not supply the labor needed or the laborers referred (mostly locals) were unreliable and poor workers. The employment department in turn has pointed out that it has an obligation to place unemployed locals and that growers may be unjustifiably critical of the workers referred.

The variance in climatic conditions and the lack of a surplus worker pool upon which to draw have placed the independent labor contractors in an important position, even though they no longer control the major portion of available seasonal labor. Contractors, especially Dave Nava, control a sufficient supply of labor, however, to meet many of the peak needs. Although some of Mr. Nava's workers have the possibility of season-long employment from some growers, a number of them may be considered as marginal labor. In other words, they are likely to have periods of unemployment, caused either by adverse weather conditions or because sufficient labor is supplied from other sources.

One of Mr. Nava's complaints is that at times when his crews are unemployed, Mexican nationals are working. He contends that his workers should be given these jobs and the Mexican nationals placed on a standby basis or returned home. He stated, when interviewed, that the employment department has refused to place his workers under such circumstances. The employment department's position is that it is willing to place Mr. Nava's workers if they assure the department that they are no longer under his control. Department spokesmen state that as long as these workers owe their allegiance to Mr. Nava rather than to the grower to whom they are referred, there is no assurance that they will not leave the job as soon as Mr. Nava finds other employment for them. If Mexican nationals are returned to the border under these circumstances, a grower could find himself without labor at a time when he needs it most.

Further Comments on Labor Reallocation. Observation of the Empire Field Crops' reallocation program indicates that the association may be placing more emphasis on the recontracting and reallocation of braceros than on the retention and reallocation of domestic workers. This observation is supported by the results of the migrant interviews in the Rocky Ford--LaJunta area. Analysis of these interviews shows that 48.5 per cent of the interstate migrants leave the area by July 30, with a considerable number leaving between June 30 and July 10. Subtracting those workers leaving during this period who are employed by Mr. Nava and those who probably would not be willing to remain in the area or to go to another section of Colorado, for other reasons (employment in another state, desire to return home), it is estimated that 35 per cent of the interstate workers who leave after early season pre-harvest activities might be retained in the area or routed to another part of the state. Application of this proportion to employment department estimates of interstate migrants indicates that 160 workers fall in this category.

In the Lamar area, the migrant questionnaires indicate that approximately one-half of the early interstate migrants leave by July 30. After making allowances for those whose interviews indicated that it would not be possible to encourage them to work either in the Rocky Ford --LaJunta area or elsewhere in Colorado, it was estimated that 28 per cent of these early season workers might be available for work in other areas.

This estimate, applied to the number of interstate migrants reported by the employment department's Lamar office, shows a total of 110 workers in this category.

The results of this analysis were discussed with employment department officials at the March 16, 1962 meeting of the Migrant Labor Committee. At that time, the director of the employment department said that the department was aware that many domestic workers do leave the state and that the department tries to encourage these workers to stay in Colorado. At the time the workers are recruited, they are informed of job opportunities throughout the state and are encouraged to make commitments for some of these jobs if they can be worked into their schedules. He pointed out that many workers won't follow a plan, once it has been set up, but seem to prefer to follow the whims of chance and fancy and trust to luck that they will find a job. He also remarked that it is only natural that the farmers and processors should try to avoid advancing transportation costs, even though it might encourage workers to go to another area of the state where they were needed. The supply of labor may diminish in the next few years, however, to the extent that growers and processors may have to advance much more in transportation costs for domestic workers than they do at present.[4]

Broomcorn Harvest. The broomcorn harvest usually begins during the middle of September and reaches a peak at the end of the month but may continue through the first two weeks in October. Usually this harvest is handled almost entirely by domestic workers. Local and intrastate workers are joined by a large number of interstate migrants, most of which are Cherokee Indians from Oklahoma. In the past few years, this pattern has been altered only once, in 1961, when more than 200 Mexican nationals were employed during the height of the broomcorn harvest. Employment department officials explained that the 1961 harvest was about twice the size of the 1960 harvest, and the workers who usually came to Colorado from Oklahoma were in demand in their home state and in New Mexico for the large broomcorn crops in these states; for this reason, Mexican nationals were needed.[5]

Wage Rates and Earnings

The average hourly wage rate for domestic seasonal farm labor increased almost 44 per cent in the Arkansas Valley between 1960 and 1962. Piece rates during harvest season have also increased, but it is impossible to calculate the per cent of over-all increase because of the number of variables involved (different crops and methods of payment). The usual hourly rate offered seasonal workers in 1960 was $.65 per hour. The general hourly rate in 1961 was $.75 per hour, although the migrant questionnaires showed that some workers were still being employed at $.65 per hour. During the 1962 growing season, the usual hourly rate reported in the employment department farm labor bulletin was $.90 per hour, although some pre-harvest activities were reported at $.75 to $.85 an hour. Prior to the middle of May, the employment department farm labor bulletins reported pre-harvest wage rates at $.70 and $.75 per hour. It should be noted that these rates do not apply to pre-harvest work in sugar beets. The rates for this work are set by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture and are as follows:

---

[4] Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of March 16, 1962.

[5] Ibid.

Hand Blocking and Thinning----	$15.50 per acre	1961 & 1962
Hand Hoeing and Trimming------	11.50 per acre	
Hand Hoeing------------------	9.50 per acre	
Hand Weeding-----------------	6.00 per acre	

The changes in hourly wage rates for domestic workers (not including sugar beet pre-harvest activities) correspond in timing and amount to changes in the minimum hourly rate which must be paid Mexican nationals. During the 1960 growing season, Mexican nationals employed in the Arkansas Valley received $.65 per hour. On May 4, 1961, the Secretary of Labor ruled that Mexican nationals employed in the Arkansas and San Luis valleys must be paid a minimum of $.75 per hour. This decision by the Secretary of Labor was based upon the following considerations:[6]

> 1. Mexican national workers form a large proportion of the total workers employed...in these areas. In the Arkansas Valley in 1960, 47 per cent of the workers employed...during the peak period were Mexican national workers... The prevailing wage rate for domestic workers in these areas [San Luis Valley included] was $.65 per hour in 1960. In contrast, few Mexican national workers were employed in this activity [vegetable pre-harvest] in other areas of Colorado. No Mexican national workers were employed in this activity in the Western Slope and San Juan Basin areas. In Northern Colorado less than five per cent of total employment in this activity at peak consisted of Mexican national workers. The prevailing rate for these activities for domestic workers in these areas was $.75 per hour.
>
> Thus it is found that the lower wage rate paid domestic workers in the Arkansas Valley...areas was directly associated with the availability of Mexican national workers.

---

[6] Notice to: Colorado Department of Employment, All Employers who Might Wish to Use Mexican Nationals in Miscellaneous Vegetable Pre-harvest Activities in the Arkansas Valley and the San Luis Valley in Colorado, and other Interested Parties, from Robert C. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment Statistics, May 4, 1961.

2. The 1961 United States Department of Agriculture determination for sugar beet hand operations increased the minimum "fair and reasonable" wage rate from $.75 to $.85 per hour.

3. Average hourly earnings of Mexican national workers employed at piece rates in other activities in the Arkansas Valley and San Luis Valley range from $.84 to $1.13. Domestic workers are paid the same piece rates as Mexican national workers in these other activities and it is reasonable to assume that their piece rate earnings are approximately the same as the Mexican national workers.

4. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, the average annual cash wage rate per hour in Colorado was $.912 in 1960.

Employment department representatives and Empire Field Crops officials stated that the $.10 increase in hourly rates for domestic workers was encouraged by the employment department and agreed to voluntarily by the growers, even though it increased labor costs. Nevertheless, the increase in rates for both Mexican nationals and domestic workers occurred at approximately the same time. No information has been obtained as to whether the 1962 increase for domestic workers was approved by the growers independently of the Secretary of Labor's ruling raising the rate for Mexican nationals to $.90 an hour. Both rate increases took place at approximately the same time, however.

Effect of Braceros on Wage Rates for Domestics. Public Law 78, which provides for the contracting and employment of Mexican nationals, specifies that Mexican nationals may not be employed at a rate less than the prevailing wage in the area, and state employment departments are required to make wage surveys to determine the prevailing rates for crop activities for which a shortage of domestic labor has been certified, so that Mexican nationals may be imported. This provision was placed in Public Law 78 for two reasons: 1) to protect domestic workers from having their wage levels depressed through the employment of braceros at a lower rate; and 2) to assure the Mexican government that its citizens would be paid a wage commensurate with that received by American workers.

Experience has indicated that this provision of Public Law 78 has not worked exactly as expected. In the Arkansas Valley, as indicated above, the rate set for Mexican nationals by the Secretary of Labor during the past three years has tended also to be the rate paid domestic workers. It can be argued (as the Secretary of Labor has) that if the rate set for Mexican nationals in one area is lower than in other areas, and the rate for domestic workers is pegged at the same level, domestic workers will go elsewhere, thus creating a domestic labor shortage and assuring a need for braceros. Because of this apparent interrelationship between wage rates for domestic and Mexican national workers, the Secretary of Labor, in effect, is setting a minimum wage for an area when he establishes the wage rate for Mexican nationals. This is one reason why many growers in the Arkansas Valley have objected strongly to the 1962 ruling pegging the wage rate for Mexican nationals at $.90 an hour.

Another problem has resulted from the requirement that Mexican nationals be paid not less than $.90 an hour. This ruling also applies to the harvest of crops for which workers are traditionally paid on a piece rate basis, such as cucumbers, tomatoes, and onions. Mexican nationals are guaranteed $.90 an hour for the harvest of these crops, whether or not their piece rate earnings equal this amount. Some growers have reported that their Mexican workers have not been performing at maximum efficiency because of the lack of incentive resulting from the $.90 an hour guarantee. Domestic workers are still paid on a piece rate basis with no hourly guarantee but often won't work in certain crop harvests such as tomatoes and cucumbers. In a number of instances, this has placed the grower in a "pickle."

Wage Rate Determination. The establishment of the wage rate for sugar beet hand labor by the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the influence of bracero wage rates on the rates paid domestics narrow considerably wage determination by individual growers. It is difficult to assess accurately the extent to which a growers' organization such as Empire Field Crops influences the wage pattern for seasonal farm labor. Empire Field Crops officials have stated that they do not determine the wage rates to be paid by the association's members. The organization may suggest wage rates but does not require that these rates be paid by members. It is unlikely, however, that many association members would deviate appreciably from the wage rates suggested by their own organization. The association published its wage rate schedule in 1961 with the following comments: "At a meeting of the Board of Directors of Empire Field Crops, Inc., at La Junta, Colorado on May 1, 1961, the following wage scale was determined and set for the 1961 season."[7] Field interviews and observations indicated that generally the rates determined by Empire Field Crops were being followed by most growers whether or not they were members of the association.

Wages Received by Migrant Workers. The migrants who were interviewed were asked several questions concerning time worked and earnings, both for the week previous to the interview, and for all weeks spent in the Arkansas Valley between April 1 and the time interviewed during the 1961 growing season. This information was tabulated for family groups and single workers. Table 9 shows the mean, median, and high and low earnings during the previous week as reported to interviewers. Also shown are the number of workers per family unit, the number of hours worked by family units and single workers, and the amount earned per hour.

---

[7] Wage Scale for 1961, Empire Field Crops, Board of Directors, May 1, 1961.

TABLE 9

Previous Week's Earnings
By Migrants in the Arkansas Valley, 1961

	Mean	Median	High	Low
Family				
Amount earned	$90.53	$82.00	$325.00	$13.00
Number of workers	3	3	6	1
Number of hours worked	110	100	300	15
Amt. earned per hour	$ .823	$ .82	---	---
Single Workers				
Amount earned	$30.13	$25.00	$81.00	$10.00
Number of hours worked	37.7	40	72	16
Amt. earned per hour	$ .799	$ .625	---	---

Table 10 shows the mean, median, and high and low average weekly earnings by family groups and single workers from April 1, 1961 to the time interviewed.

TABLE 10

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st
Until Time of Interview, Arkansas Valley, 1961

	Family	Single
Mean	$ 32.27	$ 35.77
Median	27.25	25.00
Low Average	5.20	12.00
High Average	133.00	108.00

The difference between the earnings of family groups, as shown in Tables 9 and 10, illustrates the chaotic economic existence of migrant workers. Many of them had arrived in the Arkansas Valley before much employment was available, and there were a number of days of bad weather when it was impossible to work. A number of them had been able to obtain groceries on credit, and, generally, housing was provided free of charge. Otherwise, few of them would have been able to exist until work was available on a full-time basis. A number of migrants had moved around quite a bit since April 1, and the time consumed in travel cut deeply into possible working hours.

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

In the eastern part of the Arkansas Valley, housing for domestic migrants and Mexican nationals is concentrated in the area between Lamar and Granada. There is also some housing in and around

Holly. Housing in the Rocky Ford -- La Junta area is scattered from Swink in the east to Fowler on the west. There is also some housing located in Crowley and Bent counties and to the south of La Junta.

Concentrated Housing. There are few large housing concentrations, with on-the-farm housing the rule rather than the exception. One of the largest concentrations of housing is at the Swink camp. This camp has 27 units of 2 rooms each and is operated by Empire Field Crops. Both Mexican nationals and domestic workers are housed at the camp, and it is used as a staging area. Newly-arrived workers live at the camp until assigned to growers, who then provide housing for them. The units are constructed of brick and clay tile; each unit has an outside water tap; and there are central bathing and laundry facilities. The Swink camp was among the best housing found in the Arkansas Valley.

There are four concentrated housing areas owned by the American Crystal Sugar Company. Two of these areas are near Rocky Ford and two between Lamar and Granada. There are a number of individual houses located in each area. American Crystal assigns the housing located near Rocky Ford to growers who have leased land from the company. The number of housing units provided is proportional to the amount of acreage a tenant has. A number of these units have been subleased free by some growers to Dave Nava on the condition he will supply labor when needed.

These houses are leased to growers free of charge by American Crystal. Formerly the company assumed full responsibility for the maintenance and repair of these units. Starting in 1961, however, the company turned this responsibility over to the growers, although it still offered to provide paint and calcimine, if the growers would provide the labor. Company officials, when interviewed, stated that the provision of housing had proved to be a heavy burden financially and that they were trying to transfer some of this burden to the growers who benefited from having the housing available. They recognized that some growers had a tendency to neglect the upkeep on these units and that there were instances where migrants had misused the facilities.

American Crystal's housing in the Lamar--Granada area is operated by the company rather than leased to individual growers. Prior to 1961, no charge was made to growers for housing their workers or for maintenance and repair. The company initiated a per acre housing charge to growers in the Lamar area in April, 1961. This charge was in keeping with the company's intent to shift some of the financial burden.

There are several other small concentrations of housing, including three railroad section houses containing about four units each. These section houses were among the worst housing examined in the valley. Perhaps the poorest housing of all was found at the Manzanola camp. This camp is located north of the railroad tracks just outside of the Manzanola town limits and consists of adobe buildings erected in 1911. At the time the camp was visited, there were two outside toilets and one water tap for a potential population of 300. This camp was filled during onion harvest in 1961 but only had a few residents in 1962. It has been used from time to time, despite the fact that it has been condemned for the past three years by the Otero County Health Department.

Housing Subleases. As indicated earlier, it is not at all uncommon in the Arkansas Valley to find migrant housing subleased one or more times. This practice makes it difficult to find out who is responsible for the housing and for the people living in it. The Manzanola camp is a good example of the difficulties occasionally encountered by the health department because of such arrangements. When the camp was occupied during the 1961 onion harvest, the director of the Otero County Health Department went to see the camp's owner. The owner said he had no knowledge that there were people living in the camp and that he was receiving no rent from any of the units. It was his opinion that a labor contractor had moved the workers and their families in. The labor contractor said that he wasn't aware there were any crews living in the Manzanola camp. He thought that some of the crew leaders were responsible. The crew leaders said that they were told to use the Manzanola camp by the labor contractor. After another examination of conditions at the camp, the director of the health department tried to have the area sprayed and cleaned up to get rid of insects and filth and to avoid any possible outbreak of disease. The owner of the property refused to pay for the spraying and cleanup, because he was receiving no rent from the people living in the camp. The labor contractor refused to pay, as did the crew leaders, as they all disclaimed responsibility for housing migrants in the camp. The Manzanola Town Board also refused to be responsible for spraying and cleaning up the camp, because it is located outside of the town's incorporated limits.

On-the-farm Housing. Housing provided on individual farms varied from very good to uninhabitable, with much of it at least adequate. Some of the migrants interviewed stated that they would probably not return to the valley during the following season because of poor housing, and, if they did return, they would not work for the same grower. On the other hand, some migrants indicated satisfaction with the housing provided and said that either this had been an inducement for them to return this year or would be a factor in their returning in 1962. A number of the growers interviewed who had good housing stated that the same workers had been employed by them for several years, and they felt that the housing provided by them was a major reason why these workers came back year after year.

According to the head of the Western Canning Company, there is a trend in the valley toward on-the-farm housing rather than centralized housing for migrants. He attributed this trend to: 1) a desire on the part of growers to have their labor located near the fields in which they were to work; and 2) an attempt by growers to avoid the transportation, health and other problems which can develop when large numbers of people are concentrated in one place.

Officials of the American Crystal Sugar Company were of the opinion that farmers were trying to eliminate on-the-farm housing because of the expense and the problems involved in maintenance and repair. This viewpoint is also held by the director of the Otero County Health Department. It is his opinion that now that federal loans are available for the construction of farm labor camps there will be greater interest in centralized housing. One such camp is being considered for the Manzanola area.

For several years, an effort was made to establish a central farm labor camp at the U. S. Air Force installation located north of La Junta. This installation is now used for the Colorado Boys Ranch. According to the director of the La Junta area employment department office, there was insufficient interest by growers and processors to make the project successful.

Employment Department Inspections. In 1962, the employment department made an effort to inspect all farm labor housing in the state. These inspections were made pursuant to a U. S. Department of Labor regulation which gave the employment department the authority to refuse to provide interstate workers for growers where housing did not meet the minimum requirements and who did not correct deficiencies. The findings of these 1962 inspections in the Arkansas Valley are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11

State Department of Employment
Housing Inspections, Arkansas Valley, 1962

	Area Office			
	La Junta	Rocky Ford	Lamar	Total
Number of units inspected	109	138	126	373
Good	59	13	56	128
Fair	50	36	47	133
Poor	---	11	23	34
Not Acceptable	---	78	---	78

The department found 21 per cent (or 78 housing units) unacceptable; all of these were located in the Rocky Ford area. When a unit is found unacceptable growers are given a list of deficiencies and requested to make the necessary improvements. No report is yet available on the correction of deficiencies in these 78 units. Almost nine per cent of the housing inspected in the Arkansas Valley was found to be poor; 133 units or 36 per cent were classified as fair; and 34 per cent were classified as good.

The standards used by the employment department include such items as floor space per worker, presence of screens and windows, distance of unit from water supply and toilet facilities. The department is not qualified to make, and does not make, sanitary inspections. This is a health department function. The employment department inspections do not apply to housing for migrants provided by non-growers, e.g., the Manzanola camp.

Prior to the establishment of the employment department inspection program, Empire Field Crops examined the housing of its members and encouraged improvement in the facilities provided.

Migrant Care of Housing. The field study revealed that, in some instances, migrant tenants had not taken care of their housing units, had damaged the property, and had scattered debris. By and large, this was not the case. The housing units of at least 90 per cent of the migrants interviewed were kept in as good a condition as might be expected, considering the type of facility in which they were living. It is understandable that prior unpleasant experiences would make some growers reluctant to spend very much to improve migrant housing. A number of growers, who feel that housing would and should be improved, recommended the development of a program to instruct migrants in the proper use of facilities and the consequences of bad sanitation practices.

Otero County Health Department. The director of the Otero County Health Department, who is also a sanitarian, inspects migrant housing in the county as often as his schedule permits and has succeeded in getting some housing units improved and others destroyed. It was his opinion that he lacked adequate enforcement power, but this view was expressed prior to the adoption of the housing and sanitation regulations by the State Board of Public Health. He feels that there has been very little improvement in housing for migrants in the past two years despite his efforts and those of the employment department and Empire Field Crops.[8]

Health Programs and Needs

Migrant Nurse Program. During the growing season each year, the Otero County Health Department employs a nurse who works only with migrants. This program is financed with federal funds and has its counterparts in other areas of the state. Primary emphasis is placed on the health of migrant children, and an immunization program is provided. The nurse visits migrant families, presents movies in the different housing areas, and tries to carry out an educational program in conjuction with her other duties. The program has been accepted by both migrants and growers and has been quite successful within the limits imposed by funds, time, and personnel available.

Although both Bent and Prowers counties have public health nurses, Otero County has the only organized health department in the valley; thus, there are no special programs for migrants except in Otero County.

Health Needs. In December, 1961, the Otero County Medical Society held a joint meeting with growers, community leaders, and state and local health department officials. At this meeting, discussion centered on the development of a study of migrant health needs. It was felt that such a study was needed before a meaningful migrant health program could be established. This study has been conducted during the 1962 growing season, and it is hoped that it will lead to the establishment of an outpatient clinic for migrant workers and their families. It is expected that initially the clinic will stress treatment of chronic ailments, because of the general lack of medical attention provided migrants.

---

8. Legislative Council Hospital and Medical Care Committee, Meeting of September 13, 1962, Otero County Court House, La Junta.

The director of the Otero County Health Department, in commenting on migrant health and medical needs, stated that most of their illnesses were chronic rather than communicable. He cited malnutrition as a common problem. There are some communicable diseases prevalent, such as tuberculosis and intestinal infections. There is more day-to-day illness among migrants than among other farm workers. Often they tolerate a condition which needs medical attention, because they don't know where to go or what to do about it.[9]

The need for an occupational health program has been recognized by the Otero County Health Department. It is hoped that information on occupational health problems can be gathered~~,~~ when and if the outpatient clinic is established.

Education and Welfare

Migrant Schools

The only migrant summer school program in the Arkansas Valley is held in Rocky Ford. The school has been in operation for seven years. During the first year, there were 50 children enrolled, and this number has increased to 105 during the 1962 season. School usually starts at the end of May and continues through the first week of July. In 1961, the school had five teachers and a full-time nurse, in addition to the principal.

The school covers a wide area -- from the Pueblo County line on the west to the Swink camp on the east. Three school bus routes are maintained to transport migrant youngsters to and from the school. The children are placed in the five classes according to their educational achievement rather than age. A number of them have been in the Rocky Ford migrant school for several years. Often these children have not been to school elsewhere during the year. The school principal is of the opinion that some migrant families return to the Rocky Ford area each year because of the school. When the school was first established, many parents were reluctant to send their children, and it often took several visits by the principal before they would be willing for their children to go to school. Although an occasional parent still balks at enrolling his children in the summer school, generally the program is accepted.

The Rocky Ford school program was considered to be one of the best in the state by the Migrant Labor Committee. The school has been successful in several ways:

1) Many children overcome the handicaps caused by an inadequate knowledge of English, and many improve considerably their grade achievement level.

2) The summer school experience encourages many of them to attend school during the regular school year whenever possible.

---

[9] *Ibid*.

3) The children receive an introduction to Anglo society and culture without destroying their Spanish background.

4) The children learn about cleanliness and nutrition. (They eat lunch at the school, take showers twice a week, and brush their teeth daily.)

Lamar Area. There appears to be a sufficient number of migrant families in the Lamar -- Granada area during the time that the Rocky Ford migrant school is open to justify the establishment of a school in or near Lamar. This possibility of establishing a migrant school in the area was discussed at the June 6 meeting of the Migrant Labor Committee in Lamar. There was little interest expressed, even though the school would be financed by state funds.

Regular School Attendance

Migrant children were encouraged to attend regular school sessions in the Rocky Ford area, even before state reimbursements were available. During the 1961-1962 school year, 55 migrant children were reported as having attended during the regular term (either in the late spring or early fall). No other school district in the Arkansas Valley reported attendance by migrant children during the 1961-1962 regular school year. Most migrant families leave the area before the start of the school year in September; so very little attendance during the fall should be expected. In the spring, however, there is a considerable number of families in the area before school is out. It is doubtful, however, whether many of the migrant children would gain much benefit from attending three to six days at the end of the school term.

Migrant Attitude Toward Education

The migrant families interviewed were asked how many years of school did they wish their children to have. The responses indicate that the migrants recognize the value of education for their children, even though they, themselves, may have had little, if any, formal education. Almost 60 per cent of those who were asked this question said that they would like their children to complete the 12th grade. Included in this group were three-fourths of those who had no formal education. Only 10 per cent had no opinion as to how many years of formal education their children should have. With one exception, all of the rest thought their children should have at least eight years of school, and eight per cent thought their children should have education beyond the high school level. The attitude of migrants in the Arkansas Valley toward the amount of formal education their children should have is shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children,
Arkansas Valley, 1961

Migrant's Years of School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend				
	7	8	12	12+	No Opinion
0		3	15		2
1		1			
2		3		1	
3	1	4	6		2
4		2	4	1	1
5		4	2	1	2
6			6	3	1
7			4		
8			3		
9			2		
10			3		
Total	1	17	45	6	8

Welfare

With the exception of a cash payment of $2.00 (reason unspecified) in Prowers County, no emergency welfare assistance for migrants in the Arkansas Valley has been reported for the 1961 and 1962 growing seasons. The director of the Otero County Welfare Department told the Migrant Labor Committee that very few migrants are stranded in the area and that Otero County has not provided for emergency aid, because the county's general assistance funds are limited.[10] He recommended that federal or state funds be provided for this purpose, because a county should not have to assume this burden for non-residents.[11]

Day Care. There are no organized day care programs for preschool migrant children in the Arkansas Valley. If both parents are working, either these younger children are taken to the fields with their parents or left in the care of a slightly older child. The dispersion of housing for migrants throughout the valley would necessitate an extensive transportation program (similar to that of the Rocky Ford school), if day care centers were to be successful.

The Migrant

All of the migrant workers in the Arkansas Valley are Spanish-American. Most of them come from the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, a few from other parts of Texas, and the remainder from the Taos area in Northern New Mexico.

---

[10] Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee, Rocky Ford Meeting, June 5, 1961.

[11] Ibid.

One hundred migrant interviews were conducted in the Arkansas Valley during June and the first two weeks in July, 1961. These 100 interviews covered 240 workers and 496 people in all. Seventy-eight interviews were conducted with family members and 22 with single workers. Information on the number of interviews is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Number of Migrant Interviews
and the Number of Workers and People Included,
Arkansas Valley, June-July, 1961

	Male Over 16	Female Over 16	Children Under 16	Total
Number of Interviews	91	9	---	100
Number of Workers	138	71	31	240
Number of People	138	106	253	496

The Migrant Generally

It is difficult to draw a composite picture of the Arkansas Valley migrant worker; some general observations may be made, however. If he is the head of a family, he is probably between 35 and 40 years of age and his wife is ten years younger. He has been a migratory worker for nine years before the 1961 growing season but has spent only two previous summers working in Colorado. He is a seasonal farm worker because he has no other job skills and would otherwise be unemployed. His lack of other job skills is explained largely by the fact that he has only a sixth grade education. He probably has four or five children, and both his wife and his children have come with him to Colorado.

His home state is probably Texas, but he may have come from New Mexico. He obtained his present employment by one of three methods: 1) through the employer directly (either for the first time or by returning to his place of employment during the previous season); 2) through his crew leader or a labor contractor; or 3) through the department of employment in Colorado or in his home state. Both he and his wife are working, and perhaps one or two of his children are employed in the fields from time to time as well.

He and his family probably came to the Arkansas Valley in May, but he might have come in the latter part of April. If he came in May, he will stay two to three months. If he arrived in April, he may work for a longer period before leaving the valley. More than likely he will leave the valley in July or no later than early August. The chances are two in three that he will return to his home state. If he is going elsewhere to seek work, it is more likely to be in another state than in another area of Colorado. It may be a state close to Colorado, such as Oklahoma or Nebraska, but he may go further east to Wisconsin, Michigan or Ohio. Even California or Florida may be his next stop, but this is not likely. If he stays in Colorado, he will work either in the San Luis Valley or Northern Colorado, but there is a slim possibility he may go to the Grand Junction area for fruit harvest. If he prefers working in Colorado and plans to return, he lists weather, type of crop, treatment by growers, wages, housing, and the length of growing season, in that order, as his reasons. If he does not like working in Colorado and plans not to return, it is because of wages and housing primarily.

During the winter months, if he was employed at all, it probably was as a farm laborer. He probably worked between seven and 10 weeks during the winter and earned between $300 and $400.

He and his family traveled to Colorado either by truck or passenger car. He probably brought himself and his family, but they may have traveled with a crew leader, relatives, or friends. The chances are excellent that he came to Colorado primarily for pre-harvest work in sugar beets. If he did, either he or his crew leader received a travel advance. In some instances, he may have received a travel advance from a labor contractor.

The chances are one in two that he owns his home in his state of residence. His house has electricity and running water, but he is less likely to have hot water, and the chances are slim that he has a shower. The chances are five to one that he has an outside privy rather than indoor plumbing and three to one that he has an icebox rather than an electric refrigerator. He probably also owns his own car or truck, and it is likely to be at least five years old and may be 10 years old or more. He is probably making time payments on his vehicle, especially if it is less than five years old.

Single Migrants. The single migrant worker in the Arkansas Valley is between 20 and 25 years of age and has been a migrant worker for four years prior to the 1961 growing season, which would be his third spent in Colorado. His reasons for being a seasonal farm laborer are the same as those of the family head. On the average, he has had one more year of school than the married migrant worker. With few exceptions, his home state is Texas. Otherwise, he comes from New Mexico.

He obtained employment in the Arkansas Valley in the same way as the married migrant worker. He arrived in the valley in late April or early May and plans to work three or four months but might stay as long as six months if work is available. He will probably return to his home state, but if he seeks employment elsewhere it may be either in the San Luis Valley or Northern Colorado, unless he leaves the state. If he leaves Colorado, he is most likely to go to Michigan, Oregon, or Oklahoma.

If he prefers to work in Colorado and plans to return the following year it is because of wages, weather, and type of crop. Wages and housing are listed in that order as the reasons why he does not like to work in Colorado and does not plan to return.

He probably did not work during the winter months, but if he did, more than likely he was a farm laborer, worked about four weeks, and earned between $140 and $150.

He traveled to Colorado either by truck or car, but if he came by truck it was usually with friends or relatives. He probably received a travel advance if he came to Colorado for sugar beet preharvest work.

Statistical Information. The following tables contain some of the information from the questionnaires upon which the above summaries were based:

TABLE 14

Years as a Migrant Worker,
Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961

Years	Family	Single	Total
No Previous Work	1	1	2
1	2		2
2	6	4	10
3	5	5	10
4	4	1	5
5	3	4	7
6	2		2
7	4	2	6
8	6	2	8
9	6		6
10	6		6
11 to 15	11	2	13
16 to 20	5	1	6
21 to 25	8		8
26 to 30	6		6
Over 31	2		2
Not Known	1		1
Totals	78	22	100

TABLE 15

Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961

Years	Family	Single	Total
Not in Colorado Before	26	4	30
1	7	4	11
2	7	5	12
3	10	4	14
4	6	3	9
5	2	1	3
6	5		5
7	4	1	5
8	3		3
9	1		1
10	2		2
11 to 15	3		3
16 to 20	2		2
21 to 25			
26 to 30			
Over 31			
Totals	78	22	100

TABLE 16

Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or Not Work In Colorado, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

Reason	Family		Single		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wages	27	13	8	3	35	16
Housing	17	6	3	2	20	8
Type of Crops	23	1	5		28	1
Length of Season	16	1	4		20	1
Treatment	13	1	3		16	1
Community Attitude	15		3		18	
Weather	43	5	7	1	50	6
Other	4		3	1	7	1
Total[a]	158	27	36	7	194	34

a. Multiple reasons given by some interviewees.

TABLE 17

Return to Colorado Next Year, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961

Reason	Family		Single		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wages	36	7	8	3	44	10
Housing	19	4	2	2	21	6
Type of Crops	31		4		35	
Treatment	28		4		32	
Community Attitude	47		4		51	
Other	4	3	4	1	8	4
Total[a]	165	14	26	6	191	20

a. Multiple reasons given by some interviewees.

TABLE 18

Areas to which Migrants Expected to Travel to Find Employment After Leaving the Arkansas Valley, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

State or Area	Family	Single	Total
California	1		1
Florida	2		2
Indiana	1		1
Kansas	1		1
Michigan	1	1	2
Nebraska	1		1
New Mexico	6		6
Ohio	1		1
Oklahoma	5	2	7
Oregon	1	1	2
Texas	30	6	36
Wisconsin	4		4
Northern Colorado	8	2	10
San Luis Valley	5	2	7
Western Slope	1		1
Return to Home State[a]	26	14	40
Total[b]	94	28	122

a. Will not seek further employment.

b. Total exceeds number of interviews, because some migrants indicated they would work in more than one area.

TABLE 19

Winter Jobs of Arkansas Valley Migrants in 1960, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

Type of Job	Family	Single	Total
Farm	34	5	39
Factory	8	1	9
Housework	--	--	--
Odd Jobs	10	1	11
No Work	13	9	22
Other	16	6	22
Total[a]	81	22	103

[a] Answers do not total 100 because of multiple jobs worked at during the winter.

TABLE 20

Weeks Worked and Total Winter Earnings of Arkansas Valley Migrants, 1960; Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

	Weeks Worked		Total Earnings	
	Family	Single	Family	Single
Mean	9.4	4.2	$ 384.42	$151.83
Median	7	4	240.00	140.00
Low	0	0	0	0
High	22	20	2,160.00	325.00

The Migrant and the Community

Community Attitudes

There is very little organized community interest in the migrant in the Arkansas Valley. The migrants' annual appearance during growing season is accepted as a usual occurrence, and not much concern is expressed. Nevertheless, the public programs in operation, such as the migrant school in Rocky Ford and the Otero County Health Department's migrant nurse program, are generally accepted, if not actively supported. Empire Field Crops has tried to improve migrant housing and make improvements at the Swink camp.

As can be seen from these comments, most of the interest in migrant problems is in the Rocky Ford -- La Junta area. With the exception of the mayor of Holly, very few of the public officials and community leaders in the eastern part of the valley feel that the migrant needs any special assistance programs. The mayor of Holly expressed his concern and that of the city council's over the condition of some of the housing units within the city limits. These units are inhabited by both residents and migrants, and Holly has embarked upon an urban renewal program to replace this substandard housing.

Organized Programs. The only non-public organized program for migrants is the one maintained by the Migrant Ministry in the Rocky Ford area. Each summer, a team of two or three workers come into the area to operate a traveling recreational program for migrant children. This team travels to the various housing concentrations, shows movies, conducts games, and loans toys and books to children. The Rocky Ford Council of Churches has operated a secondhand store for migrants, at which clothing and cooking utensils may be purchased at nominal prices. The Catholic Church in Rocky Ford is also very much concerned about migrant workers, and the local priests do all they can to provide assistance.

Law Enforcement Problems. Interviews with law enforcement officials throughout the Arkansas Valley (police chiefs and sheriffs) indicate that the migrant very seldom gets into trouble with the law, especially those workers who come to the valley with their families. Contrary to popular opinion, these workers are not heavy drinkers.

SAN LUIS VALLEY

Crop Activities and Acreage

Crops Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor

Potatoes, lettuce, and spinach (in that order) are the major crops for which seasonal farm labor is needed in the San Luis Valley. Other crops requiring lesser amounts of seasonal farm labor include: peas, cauliflower, cabbage, carrots, and radishes.

Potatoes. The San Luis Valley (Rio Grande County in particular) is the major potato producing area in the state.[1] In 1960, the last year for which statistics are available, the San Luis Valley had 69 per cent of the state's potato acreage and almost 70 per cent of production. Rio Grande County ranks among the top eight potato producing counties in the United States. Table 21 shows potato acreage and production by county in the San Luis Valley in 1960.

TABLE 21

Potatoes Planted and Harvested, San Luis Valley 1960[a]

County	Acres Planted	Acres Harvested	Cost per Acre	Production Costs	Value Dollars
Alamosa	5,680	5,450	210	1,144,500	$2,323,335
Conejos	4,610	4,520	215	971,800	1,914,446
Costilla	2,550	2,500	215	537,500	1,064,250
Rio Grande	20,910	20,500	211	4,333,200	8,753,846
Saguache	6,050	5,930	225	1,334,250	3,681,842
Total	39,800	38,900	214	8,321,250	$16,737,719

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1962.

Other Vegetables. More than 90 per cent of Colorado's lettuce acreage is in the San Luis Valley, primarily in Costilla County. Costilla County also has approximately two-thirds of the state's spinach acreage. The valley has almost 90 per cent of the state's acreage planted in green peas for market. Other vegetable crops for which the San Luis Valley's acreage constitutes at least 30 per cent of the state's total include: cabbage, carrots, and cauliflower.

Commercial vegetable acreage, except potatoes, in the San Luis Valley in 1960 is shown in Table 22.

---

[1] Weld County's acreage exceeds that of each San Luis Valley county except Rio Grande. As a whole, the valley has almost three times as much potato acreage as Weld County.

TABLE 22

Commercial Vegetables, Acres Harvested for Market, San Luis Valley, 1960[a]

County	Cabbage	Carrots	Cauliflower	Lettuce	Green Peas	Spinach	Total
Alamosa	350	10	140	800	70	50	1,420
Conejos	40		40	800	600	50	1,530
Costilla	250	350	90	2,400	80	1,540	4,710
Rio Grande	10		10	700	70	30	820
Saguache	10			900	30		940
Total	660	450	280	5,600	850	1,670	9,420

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1962.

Crop Values. Potatoes are the most important crop grown in the valley as far as value is concerned. This is true in each valley county, except Costilla, where lettuce and spinach are more important. Table 23 shows the comparison of values for potatoes, all other vegetables, and other crops in the San Luis Valley in 1959, the last year for which these data are available.

TABLE 23

Comparison of Values for Potatoes, All Other Vegetables, and Other Crops San Luis Valley, 1959[a]

County	Potatoes Value $	Other Vegetables Value $	Other Crops[b] Value $
Alamosa	$ 1,541,050	$ 456,925	$ 275,434
Conejos	1,455,210	471,673	707,617
Costilla	835,550	2,470,321	228,475
Rio Grande	7,425,389	149,616	730,833
Saguache	1,826,000	207,818	526,676
Total	$13,084,199	$3,456,354	$2,469,035

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final, 1960 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1961.
b. Corn, spring wheat, oats and barley.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

Potatoes. During the decade 1950-1960, potato acreage in the San Luis Valley increased slightly more than 20 per cent. Potato acreage in Alamosa County increased 56 per cent during the 10-year period, and 28 per cent in Costilla County; no valley county had a decrease. Potato acreage increased at a much greater rate in the valley than in the rest of the state. In 1950, the valley had 59 per cent of the state's potato acreage as compared with 69 per cent in 1960. During the same period, production increased almost 40 per cent in the San Luis Valley as compared with slightly less than 10 per cent for the state as a whole.

Other Vegetables. Total acreage in vegetables for commercial market in the San Luis Valley decreased almost 22 per cent from 1950 to 1960, even though lettuce and spinach acreage increased substantially. The change was most noticeable in Costilla County, where lettuce acreage increased from 500 to 2,400 and spinach acreage from 50 to 1,540. During the same period cabbage acreage in Costilla County decreased from 800 to 250 and cauliflower from 850 to 90.

Cauliflower acreage decreased substantially for the valley as a whole, from 1,950 to 280 acres, or almost 86 per cent. Another crop which had greatly reduced acreage during the 10-year period was green peas. Acreage decreased from 3,150 to 850; most of this decrease was in Conejos County. The availability of and public preference for frozen peas has virtually eliminated the fresh pea market, and this is the major reason why pea acreage has been so greatly reduced. This may also be the reason for the reduction in cauliflower acreage, but no specific comments were made about the decrease in cauliflower acreage during the field interviews.

Change in Number and Size of Farms. The number of farms in the San Luis Valley decreased 30 per cent between 1950 and 1960. The greatest decrease was in Costilla County where there were 468 farms in 1950 and only 240 in 1960 (a decrease of almost 49 per cent). Conejos and Alamosa counties also had a substantial reduction in the number of farms. During the same period, there was also an increase of almost 38 per cent in farm size in the valley as a whole. The greatest increases were in Saguache, Costilla, and Conejos counties. The changes in the number and size of farms in the San Luis Valley from 1950 to 1960 is shown by county in Table 24.

TABLE 24

Number of Farms and Median Size, San Luis Valley, 1950 and 1960[a]

	Number of Farms			Median Farm Size (In Acres)		
County	1950	1960	Pct. of Change	1950	1960	Pct. of Change
Alamosa	440	338	-23.2%	224	380	+ 69.6%
Conejos	872	542	-37.9	129	243	88.3
Costilla	468	240	-48.8	49	105	114.2
Rio Grande	593	496	-16.4	238	334	40.3
Saguache	345	293	-15.1	398	854	114.6
Total	2,718	1,909	-29.8%	239	329	+ 37.6%

a. Federal Census Data.

Mechanization and Technological Change

Only 15 to 20 per cent of the potato harvest in the San Luis Valley is mechanized, and most of the mechanization is concentrated in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. Growers have been reluctant to mechanize because of rocks and the lumpy condition of the soil. Usually, if a grower intends to mechanize his harvest activities, he will derock his field as much as possible before planting. During harvest, he will have a crew separating the rocks from the potatoes as they move along the conveyor belt. While this procedure does not completely eliminate hand labor, it reduces the need for such labor approximately 50 per cent. A potato picking machine has been developed which removes the potatoes from the rocks by application of forced air. This machine was being used on an experimental basis during the 1961 growing season.

Some potato growers who are using mechanical pickers are still sacking their potatoes in 100 pound bags in the field, an operation which requires considerable hand labor both in the field and at the warehouse.

An alternative would be to load the potatoes in large boxes or directly on a truck with a specially-designed loader bed. The potatoes could either be stored in bulk or packaged at the warehouse, with considerably less hand labor and time involved. The manager of one of the potato storage plants in the San Luis Valley and a staff member at the San Luis Valley Agricultural Extension Experiment Station both advocated bulk handling and storage of potatoes. Both had been in Idaho recently and said this method had been widely adopted there. Some growers stated the two major deterrents to adoption of bulk handling and storage of potatoes are: 1) the cost of the equipment necessary; and 2) the changes required in present storage plants to make conversion to bulk storage possible.

While only a small portion of the potato harvest is now mechanized, a few of the growers with substantial potato acreage have predicted that the harvest will be entirely mechanized in a few years.

Other Vegetables. There has been no mechanization and very little technological change in the other vegetable crops grown in the San Luis Valley. In California and Arizona, there has been some use of pelletized lettuce seed and some experimentation with mechanical blocking and thinning. The growers with whom this subject was discussed were unanimous in their opinion that pelletized lettuce seed could not be used successfully in the San Luis Valley because of soil conditions and the difficulty in determining the proper planting depth. One processor commented that if pelletized seed could be adapted for use in the valley, it would reduce labor costs.

San Luis Valley growers are at a disadvantage in comparison with California, Arizona, and Rio Grande Valley (Texas) growers of the same crops with respect to research and experimentation on mechanical and technological improvements. In these other areas, crop acreage is very large and the growing season quite long, so that equipment and chemical companies conduct extensive research programs at no expense to the growers. The results of these research programs may have some general application, but their applicability is mostly for the areas in which the research was conducted. Differences in soil conditions, weather, length of growing season, altitude, and variety of crops are all reasons why it is impossible to adopt in the San Luis Valley an innovation developed in California. The San Luis Valley growers have no such large scale research sources available to them, which is one reason why mechanization and technological change is slower in the valley than in some areas in other states growing the same crops.

The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes

The San Luis Valley has been suffering from an economic decline, which is illustrated in part by the decrease in the number of farms during the past 10 years. There are no subsidies or price guarantees on the crops grown in the San Luis Valley for which seasonal labor is needed. In other areas, the Arkansas Valley for example, the growers who raise sugar beets or vegetables for processing have been able to contract acreage and price agreements with the sugar and canning companies. Almost all of the potatoes and all of the other vegetable crops (lettuce, spinach, cabbage, cauliflower, carrots, etc.) grown in the San Luis Valley are grown for the fresh food market, which can be quite unstable.

Further, San Luis Valley vegetable growers are competing with other areas which have longer growing seasons, better climate, and extensive acreage (Rio Grande Valley, Texas; Imperial Valley and Stockton area, California; and Arizona). Potato growers are competing with Idaho, North Dakota, and California; and in these states, mechanization has been extensive and the number and capacity of potato processing plants are on the increase.

Within this context, it is understandable that many growers feel they have little control over costs and prices. Some of them are trying to add to their acreage as quickly as possible, recognizing that their survival depends on large acreage and efficient operation with the hope that greater volume will offset lower per unit profits. One of the areas in which growers, at least as a group, can exercise some control is the wage level. This area of discretion, however, is circumscribed by the minimum rate set for Mexican nationals. This rate, as discussed in the preceding chapter, tends also to be the wage for domestic workers.

Many San Luis Valley growers defend the utilization of Mexican nationals (even though there is considerable local unemployment) on the grounds that local workers have been quite undependable in recent years. In interviews and in testimony at the Migrant Labor Committee's hearings in Alamosa and Monte Vista, several growers stated that: 1) Local workers often do not show up for work for two or three days at a time. 2) Their work performance often is not satisfactory, even when they do show up. 3) Many local workers are not sufficiently skilled to do an adequate job during lettuce harvest. 4) During peak harvest periods (especially potato harvest), there is an insufficient labor supply even if all available local workers are employed.

Many of these same growers were quick to add, however, that their criticism did not apply to all local workers. These growers said that they had a number of local workers who were satisfactory and reliable and who were employed on a steady basis. Critics of the growers' attitudes toward local workers told the committee and field interviewers that many locals did not wish to work or did not perform as well as they might because of low wage scales. The growers' response was that they could not afford to pay higher wages, especially when work performance was not adequate.

Because of the perishable nature of the crops grown, San Luis Valley growers need an assured supply of dependable labor when harvest is ready. The growers' attitudes toward seasonal farm labor, therefore, are conditioned by the availability and dependability of labor, as well as market and general economic conditions. While many individual growers are concerned about housing and other social conditions for their workers and their families, there is no organized program aimed at the general improvement of these conditions. It is recognized that a large number of domestic migrants are needed on an annual basis to augment the local labor supply, and their presence in and around valley communities and farms is more or less taken for granted. Some growers might wish to do more for their workers but feel that they are financially unable to do so. Other growers become so involved, of necessity, in the problems of crop production and prices that they have little time to give much thought to their migrant workers, other than as part of the production process.

Some growers stated that it was unrealistic to place such great emphasis on improving conditions for migrants when many local residents live in substandard housing and accept social conditions which are the same as those confronted by the migrant.

General Economic Conditions

During the past 10 to 12 years, the population of the San Luis Valley has declined almost 20 per cent. Three of the valley counties (Alamosa, Conejos, and Costilla) have been declared distressed areas for the purposes of redevelopment assistance. The economic and social conditions for some of the valley's residents, as pointed out above, are about the same as those generally thought of as applying to migratory workers. There are several rural slum areas in the valley, the most notable being the Lariat area located west of Monte Vista.

There has been an organized effort, especially in the northern part of the valley (Rio Grande and Saguache counties) to bring in new industry. Two potato starch plants have been opened in the Monte Vista area as a result of these efforts. These plants operate about nine months a year and employ 15 to 20 persons each. An attempt is also being made to interest potato processing firms in opening plants in the area. The possibility of establishing potato processing plants has become greater since natural gas has become available in the valley.

Some of the persons interviewed who were concerned with the valley's economic development expressed the opinion that it would be feasible to establish a frozen food processing plant for potatoes and green vegetables. At the present time, the valley has no outlet for its vegetable crops except the fresh market, which is not noted for its stability.

A number of growers indicated their pessimism over the possibilities of establishing a frozen food plant. They stated that Birdseye considered the proposition a number of years ago and rejected it. This, they felt, ended the matter. Transportation, the establishment of markets, and the length of the growing season are all factors which would have a bearing on the feasibility of such a plant. An Alamosa Chamber of Commerce official said that in 1960 there had been a possibility of having a frozen food processing plant for potatoes established in La Jara. According to this official, there was very little local interest in the project and some opposition, so the matter was dropped.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods

In the Alamosa area (Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla counties) there is not much employment of seasonal farm labor until the third week in May. This number increases steadily until the third or fourth week in July and holds at this level through most of August (lettuce and spinach harvests). Then there is a gradual decline until the end of September when there is an increase for potato harvest. The late season peak is not quite as large as the early one (2,400 as compared with 2,500 workers).

Between 800 and 900 seasonal farm workers are employed in the Monte Vista area (Rio Grande and Saguache counties) during May. This number usually increases to 1,000 in June; 1,200 in July; 1,300 in August; and 1,400 by the middle of September. During the potato harvest (late September through the middle of October), the number of seasonal farm workers varies from 3,800 to almost 5,700.

The reason for the difference in seasonal employment patterns between north and south parts of the San Luis Valley can be explained by the fact that less than 15 per cent of the commercial vegetable acreage in the valley is in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. On the other hand, two-thirds of the valley's potato acreage is in these two counties.

Table 25 shows the number of seasonal farm workers reported by the Alamosa and Monte Vista area employment department offices for selected weeks in 1961 and 1962. Also shown is the number of Mexican nationals, local workers, intrastate workers, and interstate migrants reported as employed during the weeks selected.

Employment of Locals. During 1961 and 1962, locals accounted for between 40 and 55 per cent of the seasonal farm labor force in the months of May and June for the valley as a whole. From July through August, approximately 40 per cent of the seasonal work force was local. The proportion of locals in the seasonal labor force decreased to approximately 36 per cent during potato harvest, because of labor needs which required a large number of outside workers.

TABLE 25

Seasonal Farm Labor in the San Luis Valley
by Type of Workers for Selected Weeks, 1961-1962

Week	Alamosa				Monte Vista				Total			
	1961		1962		1961		1962		1961		1962	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
June (4th week)												
Mexican Nationals	394	36.4%	645	52.0%	241	23.4%	140	21.1%	635	30.1%	785	41.2%
Locals	580	53.6	455	36.7	614	59.6	350	52.6	1,194	56.5	805	42.3
Intrastate	---	---	30	2.4	75	7.3	75	11.3	75	3.5	105	5.5
Interstate	109	10.0	110	8.9	100	9.7	100	15.0	209	9.9	210	11.0
Total	1,083	100.0%	1,240	100.0%	1,030	100.0%	665	100.0%	2,113	100.0%	1,905	100.0%
July (4th week)												
Mexican Nationals	940	36.7%	1,270	31.3%	146	12.1%	161	15.1%	1,086	28.8%	1,431	40.4%
Locals	1,132	44.2	842	34.0	840	69.7	647	60.5	1,972	52.3	1,489	42.0
Intrastate	240	9.4	75	3.0	110	9.1	100	9.4	350	9.3	175	4.9
Interstate	250	9.7	290	11.7	110	9.1	160	14.9	360	9.6	450	12.7
Total	2,562	100.0%	2,477	100.0%	1,206	100.0%	1,068	100.0%	3,768	100.0%	3,545	100.0%
August (3rd week)												
Mexican Nationals	1,017	49.9%	1,228	64.7%	289	22.4%	124	10.7%	1,306	39.3%	1,595	34.6%
Locals	619	30.4	370	19.5	770	59.7	680	58.4	1,389	41.8	2,159	46.8
Intrastate	150	7.4	50	2.6	120	9.3	170	14.6	270	8.1	390	8.4
Interstate	250	12.3	250	13.2	110	8.6	190	16.3	360	10.8	470	10.2
Total	2,036	100.0%	1,898	100.0%	1,289	100.0%	1,164	100.0%	3,325	100.0%	4,614	100.0%
Sept. (4th week)												
Mexican Nationals	615	25.6%	540	22.5%	152	3.2%	232	5.0%	767	10.6%	772	11.0%
Locals	600	25.0	850	35.4	1,800	37.3	1,600	34.6	2,400	33.2	245	34.9
Intrastate	678	28.2	150	6.2	500	10.4	600	13.0	1,178	16.3	750	10.7
Interstate	510	21.2	860	35.9	2,370	49.1	2,190	47.4	2,880	39.9	3,050	43.4
Total	2,403	100.0%	2,400	100.0%	4,822	100.0%	4,622	100.0%	7,225	100.0%	7,022	100.0%
October (2nd week)												
Mexican Nationals	278	15.0%	139	11.1%	81	1.7%	64	1.5%	359	5.5%	203	3.7%
Locals	500	27.0	568	45.2	1,800	38.9	1,400	32.9	2,300	35.5	1,968	35.7
Intrastate	525	28.4	1 0	7.9	500	10.8	500	11.8	1,025	15.8	600	10.9
Interstate	548	29.6	450	35.8	2,250	48.6	2,288	53.8	2,798	43.2	2,738	49.7
Total	1,851	100.0%	1,257	100.0%	4,631	100.0%	4,252	100.0%	6,482	100.0%	5,509	100.0%

Except for potato harvest and the months of May and June, the proportion of locals employed in the Monte Vista area was approximately twice that of the Alamosa area. During the past two years there has been a decrease in the number of locals employed during the growing season, as compared with 1960 and preceding years.

Mexican Nationals. There was an increase of approximately 60 per cent in the number of Mexican nationals employed in the San Luis Valley during the months May through August from 1960 to 1961. The increase from 1961 to 1962 in the number of Mexican nationals employed during the same period was approximately 20 per cent. Almost all of this increase was concentrated in the Alamosa area (Alamosa, Conejos, and Costilla counties). During these months, Mexican nationals constituted 22 per cent of the total seasonal farm labor force in 1960, 33 per cent in 1961, and 38 per cent in 1962.

Interstate Workers. The number of interstate workers employed in the San Luis Valley decreased almost two-thirds between 1960 and 1961 and approximately 60 per cent between 1960 and 1962 during the months of May through August. This decrease was concentrated primarily in the Alamosa area. Interstate workers accounted for 27 per cent of the seasonal farm labor force during these months in 1960 and between 10 and 12 per cent in 1961 and 1962.

Employment Department Statistics. The employment department area offices in the San Luis Valley rely, primarily, on the San Luis Valley Growers' Association for estimates of the number of seasonal farm workers employed and do not make field counts, as do offices in some other areas. For this reason, the department estimates may be low. For example, during the 1961 growing season, the employment department estimates show a weekly average of 252 interstate workers in the Alamosa area and 107 in the Monte Vista area. During the same period, 116 interstate migrants were interviewed, and field observations indicate that there were at least 300 Filipino custom lettuce workers in the valley.

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment -- Crops Other Than Potatoes

Involved in the recruitment process are the department of employment, the San Luis Valley Growers' Association, a lettuce contractor, and several of the larger growers. There is only one independent labor contractor in the valley, and he was not operating any crews during the 1961 growing season.

San Luis Valley Growers' Assn. The San Luis Valley Growers' Association had 82 members during the 1961 growing season. The association serves as the contracting agency for Mexican nationals, although only 12 of its members use them. Each grower using Mexican nationals pays the association an initial charge of $20 per bracero. This charge includes the cost of transporting a national to the valley from El Paso ($7.00). The grower using nationals contracted by the association also pays $.05 per hour per national, from which the association purchases the necessary insurance and provides transportation back to El Paso at the end of the contract period.

The association does not recruit domestic workers directly but depends on the employment department for this function. The department refers all domestic workers (local, intrastate, and interstate) to the association, which, in turn, refers them to individual growers. During July and August 1961, a number of domestic workers coming into the area bypassed the employment department and came to the association directly to obtain jobs.

The director of the association is also director of a growers' association in Arizona, and, except for the lettuce growing season in the valley, spends his time in that state. On occasion, the Colorado association will recontract braceros after their contract period has terminated in Arizona. The recontracting process may also work in reverse, i.e., from Colorado to Arizona. The association also may recontract braceros who have been employed in other areas of Colorado -- mostly around Ft. Lupton.

Brown and Martin. Brown and Martin are lettuce contractors who operate in several states, primarily Arizona and Colorado. In 1961, Brown and Martin had 1,100 acres of lettuce under contract in the San Luis Valley.[2] They are members of both the San Luis Valley and Arizona growers' associations and obtain Mexican national labor through these organizations. They often recontract the nationals employed in one of the two states to work in the other. They usually do not recruit domestic workers directly but work through the employment department and/or the growers' association.

Employment Department. The employment department's out-of-state recruitment for the San Luis Valley for crops other than potatoes is confined generally to northern New Mexico, although it was working through the Arizona employment department to recruit labor in that state; the effort was largely unsuccessful. The department also refers locals and workers from other valley counties, if they contact the department. As far as could be ascertained from the field study, the department does not actively recruit local workers, at least not to the extent of making direct contacts.

Individual Growers. A few of the largest lettuce and spinach growers recruit their own domestic workers to some extent, at least within the valley. One of these growers experienced considerable difficulty in attempting to recruit in Texas a few years ago, including running afoul of some of the local laws pertaining to recruiting fees and licenses, and has not tried to recruit in Texas since that time. These few growers have buses and transport their own labor as needed, including Mexican nationals.

---

[2] This lettuce is contracted on a 50/50 basis with growers. The grower furnishes the land, water, cultivation, and one-half of the fertilizer and insecticide needed. Brown and Martin provide the remainder of the fertilizer and insecticide, seed, all hand labor, and pack, cool, and ship the lettuce.

Filipino Lettuce Crews. There are a number of custom lettuce crews composed of skilled lettuce cutters of Filipino descent, most of whom are California natives. These crews follow the lettuce harvest throughout the western states and are in great demand because of their skill and speed in chopping and packing lettuce. At one time, more than 600 workers would travel in these crews, but it is estimated that there were only slightly more than 300 in Colorado in 1961. The number is decreasing, because second and third generation workers have left the crews either to obtain an education or to settle permanently in one of the western states. A number of Spanish-Americans from Texas have been taken with these crews as replacements and appear to have worked efficiently and to have fitted in with the crews' operations, even though some growers have commented that Spanish-American migrants are not particularly adept at lettuce cutting and harvesting.

Individual Workers and Families. A considerable number of domestic migrants from northern New Mexico, as well as workers from Costilla and Conejos counties, travel each year to the more northern counties in the valley to find seasonal employment and usually return to their previous employer without contacting either the employment department or the growers' association.

Recruitment -- Potatoes

The major source of outside workers for potato harvest include: New Mexico, Texas, the Navajo reservations in New Mexico and Arizona, and the southern part of the San Luis Valley (Costilla and Conejos counties). The major portion of the potato harvest is completed during a three-week period (last part of September and first part of October), and, at that time, as many as 7,500 workers may be needed, of whom 35-40 per cent are local workers. Very few Mexican nationals are employed during potato harvest, although the number has been increasing in recent years. The employment department works with the departments in surrounding states and with the Navajo Tribal Council to obtain a sufficient number of domestic migrants. Once the over-all arrangements are made, some growers go to the Navajo reservation and directly recruit and transport workers.

Many of the New Mexico workers and those from Costilla and Conejos counties return each year on their own to the same growers in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. Generally, the Texas workers seek employment in the potato fields in the southern part of the valley. According to the employment department, these workers prefer to be paid by the half-sack (50-lb.), which is the common practice in the southern three counties, rather than the full sack of 100 lb. (common practice in Rio Grande and Saguache counties). In 1961, some of these Texas workers came to the San Luis Valley from Northern Colorado, where they had been employed. Indians from three of the 19 New Mexico Pueblo tribes were also employed in the northern part of the valley during the 1961 harvest.

Utilization and Reallocation of Labor

It appears that the San Luis Valley Growers' Association has the major responsibility for the utilization and reallocation of labor, except during potato harvest. The employment department, as mentioned above, refers workers to the association for placement, and a number of workers bypass the employment department and contact the association directly. While the association probably controls a significant part of the labor supply, a few large growers and Brown and Martin operate more or less independently.

There are also workers, who operate more or less independently, seek their own employment and move from employer to employer as they see fit. Often this movement follows long established patterns. For example, there are a few crews from Center in Saguache County who pick peas each year near La Jara in Conejos County, even though: 1) there is employment available near Center, and Mexican nationals are brought in because of a labor shortage; and 2) there are unemployed workers in the La Jara area. The employment department did not know about this movement of workers, and the manager of the Monte Vista office indicated there was nothing he could do about coordinating this activity, because the workers were employed within the area covered by the Alamosa area, even though they traveled from the Monte Vista area.

Workers Who Leave the Area Early. Very few of the Spanish-Americans who work in other vegetables remain for potato harvest. The migrant questionnaires show that 18 per cent of the early interstate workers in the Alamosa area (southern three counties), exclusive of Filipinos, leave by July 30, and an additional 10 per cent leave by August 30. In the Monte Vista area (Rio Grande and Saguache counties), 21 per cent of the early interstate workers (exclusive of Filipinos) leave by July 30, and an additional three per cent leave by August 30.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to apply these proportions to the employment department's estimates of interstate workers with any high degree of accuracy, because the department's estimates were found by field observation to be low, and no satisfactory substitute estimate could be made from the field study. The questions can be raised, however, as to whether any effort is made to retain these workers and also whether any of them will remain (if fully employed) through potato harvest. Further, the pre-harvest season peak in the Arkansas Valley occurs sufficiently early so that, theoretically, workers leaving the area (who will not accept further employment in the Arkansas Valley) might be induced to work in the San Luis Valley or Northern Colorado. No workers from the Arkansas Valley were found in the San Luis Valley during the field survey.

An analysis was made of the 1961 employment department estimates of seasonal farm labor in the San Luis Valley during the month of August, 1961. This analysis showed that there was a decrease of more than 600 locals during the month in the Alamosa area, while over-all employment and the number of braceros increased in the Monte Vista area. Consequently, the question was raised with the employment department as to whether it would be feasible to establish a day-haul program during this period from Alamosa to the Monte Vista area to utilize the locals who were no longer working in the Alamosa area. After checking these statistics, the employment department reported that most of these workers were employed for radish, carrot, and pea harvests. They were primarily women and children and would not be suitable for employment in lettuce in the Monte Vista area, lettuce harvest being the reason for the worker increase in that area. Further, many of these women and children were employed in the packing sheds at Blanca and Fort Garland after finishing their field work.[3]

There are no organized day hauls in the San Luis Valley, and, as pointed out above, no great effort has been made to recruit domestic workers or to relate the employment of those local workers who free-wheel to the over-all labor needs of the area.

Potato Harvest. While the employment department contacts Texas crews in Northern Colorado (with some success) to obtain potato harvest workers for the San Luis Valley, there is some question as to whether very many contacts are made in the Palisade area following peach harvest. Possibly, as many as 600 workers might be available in that area for employment elsewhere in Colorado at the conclusion of peach harvest. Only four of the Navajo workers interviewed in the San Juan Basin who were working there during bean harvest indicated that they were going to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest. Conversely, none of the Navajos interviewed during potato harvest in the San Luis Valley had been employed in the San Juan Basin.

Wage Rates and Earnings

The wage rates for seasonal agricultural labor in the San Luis Valley during the 1960 and 1961 growing seasons differed somewhat between the northern and southern counties; however, this difference was not as great as it had been in prior years, nor did it extend to all crops. Prior to the 1962 order of the Secretary of Labor which established the minimum wage for braceros at $.90 per hour, the southern portions of the San Luis Valley and the Arkansas Valley were the lowest agricultural wage areas in the state. In 1960, the wage rate for pre-harvest activities in the southern three counties in the San Luis Valley was $.65. This rate also prevailed at the beginning of the 1961 growing season but shifted to $.75 an hour at approximately the same time that the 1961 ruling of the Secretary of Labor established the minimum rate for braceros at $.75 an hour. In the northern two counties, hourly wage rates were found by the field survey to be largely between $.75 and $.85 per hour, with a major portion of the workers being paid $.80 per hour. There were also a number of workers paid $45 to $50 per week for six days. Even though these were the rates found in the field survey, the director of the Monte Vista employment department stated that 99 per cent of the work orders specified a wage rate of $1.00 per hour.

Lettuce Harvest. Wages during lettuce harvest are paid on a piece rate basis. During the 1961 and 1962 seasons, the piece rate was $.215 per carton for cutting and packing a carton of lettuce. As this is a three-man activity, each man receives $.0717 per carton. Under this rate, the skilled Filipino lettuce crews were able to make as much as $1.70 per hour each, but less skilled workers make considerably less.

---

[3] Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee, Minutes of March 16, 1962.

During the 1960 growing season, Mexican nationals were employed for lettuce harvest at an hourly rate of $.75 per hour. In 1961, however, the Secretary of Labor ruled that Mexican nationals employed during lettuce harvest must receive $.215 per carton (three-man crew) or the prevailing piece rate, whichever is higher. Further, the Secretary of Labor stated that if the earnings of Mexican nationals so employed are less than $1.10 per hour, he could no longer certify that the continued employment of Mexican nationals "at this piece rate will not affect the wages of domestic workers similarly employed."[4]

The Secretary of Labor based this decision on the following factors:[5]

> Mexican National workers were employed during 1960 in the lettuce harvest at a wage rate of $.75 per hour. Domestic workers were employed at piece rates yielding earnings ranging from $1.13 to $1.70 per hour.
>
> Experience in other lettuce growing areas of the country has indicated that if Mexican national workers are made available to employers at hourly rates considerably less than the average hourly earnings earned by domestic workers employed at piece rates, there may be a substantial lessening of job opportunities for domestic workers.
>
> This condition has materialized in the San Luis Valley area in that employment of domestic workers in the lettuce harvest has declined since 1957 when Mexican nationals were first used in sizeable numbers in this crop activity. This can be seen from the following figures concerning peak employment in the activity obtained from the reports of the Colorado Department of Employment (ES-223 reports):

Year	Acreage Harvested	No. Domestics Employed	No. Mexican Nationals Used	Total
1957	7,250	1,045	360	1,405
1958	6,200	815	169	984
1959	6,400	792	308	1,100
1960	6,650	648	512	1,160

---

[4] Letter dated April 19, 1961 from Robert C. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment, Secretary U. S. Department of Labor.

[5] *Ibid*.

It is noted that while the decrease in acreage over the four-year period is only 8 per cent, during this same period there has been a decrease in the employment of domestic workers of 38 per cent and an increase in the employment of Mexican nationals of 42 per cent.

In addition to this change, earnings studies for 1960 show that the average weekly hours worked by Mexican nationals was 40 per week while the average worked by domestic workers was 31 hours per week, thus reflecting under-utilization of available domestic workers and constituting an adverse effect upon their wages.

Conflicting information has been provided the Secretary of Labor which indicates that in the past Mexican national workers employed in the lettuce harvest may have been required to produce a so-called "select" or "national" pack of uniform size heads while domestic workers were producing a "standard" pack of all size heads and that the production of the "select" pack was a slower, more time-consuming activity that would result in lower earnings if the workers were paid the same piece rate as was paid the "standard" pack. This is a situation which, if it did exist in the past, will not be permitted in 1961.

The regional office field staff is instructed to thoroughly investigate the manner in which lettuce is harvested to ascertain the type of pack produced by domestic workers and that produced by Mexican workers. This investigation should include interviews with employers, domestic workers, and foreign workers, as well as on-the-spot examination of the work done. If the results of this investigation indicate that there is a difference in the method of harvest, appropriate action will be taken by the Secretary to ensure that this practice in itself does not adversely affect the wages of domestic workers.

This problem encountered in the lettuce harvest in the San Luis Valley of Colorado is recognized not to be unique only to Colorado. We plan to proceed similarly in those other lettuce growing areas of the nation in which foreign workers are employed.

This action by the Secretary of Labor was protested by the growers on the grounds that: 1) Mexican nationals were not sufficiently skilled as lettuce pickers to be able to equal $1.10 per hour on a piece rate basis. 2) Mexican nationals preferred to be employed at an hourly rate instead of a piece rate, and $.75 per hour was more in line with their abilities as lettuce pickers and, therefore, fair to both employer and worker. 3) The earnings cited by the Secretary of Labor were those of the most highly skilled lettuce pickers and, therefore, did not represent an average wage.

As a consequence of this objection, a compromise was rendered which applied to the 1961 growing season. This compromise provided that Mexican nationals employed during lettuce harvest could be paid either $.75 per hour or $.215 per carton (three-man crew), whichever they preferred, but that their earnings must equal at least $.75 per hour. In addition, a study would be made of the productivity of these workers to determine a just and equitable rate.

Effective November 4, 1962 (and applicable to the 1963 season), the Secretary of Labor ruled that Mexican nationals employed in Colorado for lettuce harvest must be paid:

1) not less than a crew piece rate of $.24 per carton or the prevailing piece rate, whichever is higher, with guaranteed hourly earnings no less than the hourly adverse-effect rate for the state ($.90 per hour); or

2) an hourly rate not less than the adverse-effect wage rate for the state or the prevailing hourly rate for lettuce harvest work, whichever is the higher.

The workers would have the option of selecting piece rates or an hourly rate, unless the employer can show that his lettuce crop is defective to such an extent that harvesting requires special handling. In such situations, the employer may determine whether the piece rate or the hourly rate will be paid, without regard to the workers' preference.

Potato Harvest. The wage rates found by the field study to be in effect for the 1961 potato harvest in the San Luis Valley are shown in Table 26. Also shown is the number of workers receiving each rate.

TABLE 26

Wage Rates Received During Potato Harvest, San Luis Valley, 1961

Hand Picking

Rate per 100 lb. Sack	No. of Workers	Rate per 50 lb. Sack	No. of Workers
$ .12	2	$ .06	39
$ .14	27	$ .07	1
$ .15	10	mean	$ .06
$ .16	10	median	$ .06
$ .17	6		
mean	$ .148		
median	$ .14		

TABLE 26
(Continued)

Per Hour or Per Day

Rate per Hour	No. of Workers	Rate per Day	No. of Workers
$ .80	1	$ 8.00	3
$1.00	6	$10.00	6
$1.10	9	mean	$ 9.33
$1.25	6	median	$10.00
$1.50	1		
mean	$1.12		
median	$1.10		

Machine Picking

Rate per Sack	No. of Workers
$ .08	6
$ .10	4
mean	$ .088
median	$ .08

1962 Wage Rates.[6] In the Alamosa area, the hourly wage rates for vegetable pre-harvest activities were $.75 to $.90 during April and May, and,in June and July, $.90 an hour was the only rate quoted. The early season hourly rates for irrigation were $.80 to $.90, increasing to $.95 in June and July. This same rate applied to tractor operators.

With the exception of vegetable pre-harvest at $.90 per hour, the offered rate in the Monte Vista area for seasonal farm labor was $1.00 per hour during the months of April through July.

In both areas, vegetable harvest rates, except for lettuce, were $.90 an hour, with some piece rate options. The $.90 an hour rate applied to lettuce harvest in the Monte Vista area, but,in the Alamosa area, the rate was $1.00 an hour or $.24 per carton (three-man crew).

During potato harvest, the offered rates in the Monte Vista area were $.14 to $.16 per 100 pound sack or $1.00 to $1.25 per hour. The rates in the Alamosa area were $.06 per 50 pound sack, $.14 per 100 pound sack,or $1.00 per hour.

Earnings. The migrant workers interviewed in the San Luis Valley were asked how much they made during the previous week. The mean and median previous week's earnings for family groups and single workers is shown in Table 27 . This information is presented for both early season and late season workers. Many of the early season workers were employed in the spinach and lettuce harvests. All of the late season workers were employed in the potato harvest. Also shown are the mean and median hours worked and the hourly rate of earnings, which was derived by dividing the total amount earned by the hours worked. The relatively high hourly rates for early season single workers is a reflection of the skill of the Filipino custom lettuce crews, who work on a piece rate basis. The data for the late season (potato harvest) includes workers who were paid either on a piece rate or hourly basis.

---

[6] Information taken from Colorado Farm Labor Bulletin, Weekly Report by the Colorado State Employment Service.

TABLE 27

Previous Week's Earnings
By Migrants in the San Luis Valley, 1961

	Mean	Median
Early Season		
Family		
Amount Earned	$ 67.33	$50.00
Number of Workers	2	1
Number of Hours Worked	61	60
Amt. Earned per Hour	$ 1.12	$ .83
Single		
Amount Earned	$ 42.91	$40.00
Number of Hours Worked	34	30
Amt. Earned per Hour	$ 1.25	$ 1.33
Late Season		
Family		
Amount Earned	$120.36	$95.00
Number of Workers	2.5	2
Number of Hours Worked	112	84
Amt. Earned per Hour	$ 1.07	$ 1.12
Single		
Amount Earned	$ 53.11	$48.00
Number of Hours Worked	42	45
Amt. Earned per Hour	$ 1.26	$ 1.07

The workers who were interviewed were also asked how much they had earned from April 1 until the time of the interview, and this information is shown in Table 28. It should be noted that there is a considerable difference between the amount earned during the previous week and the average amount earned weekly from April 1 until the time of the interview. The former is considerably higher for all early and late season workers and illustrates the lack of steady employment during the growing season.

TABLE 28

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st
Until Time of Interview, San Luis Valley, 1961

	Family	Single
Early Season		
Mean	$35.11	$24.58
Median	29.44	18.75
Late Season		
Mean	$36.77	$17.08
Median	27.58	8.00

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

There are no large housing concentrations for migrants with families in the San Luis Valley. Some of the Filipino lettuce crews, composed of solo workers, live in two old hotels in Alamosa; otherwise, most housing is on the farm. The housing examined during the field study ranged from very poor to very good. On the average, it was adequate and compared favorably to the housing found in the Arkansas Valley.

In evaluating the housing provided for migrant workers in the San Luis Valley, two factors need to be considered: 1) the condition of the housing lived in by many of the valley's low income residents; and 2) the brevity of the potato harvest season. As indicated previously in this chapter, some of the residential housing in the valley is on a par with some of the less than adequate migrant housing. Housing which might not be adequate on a season-long basis is satisfactory for the two or three weeks during potato harvest, especially since some of the potato harvest crews live near enough to their place of employment to return home on weekends.

There is no organized health department in the valley, although almost all of the counties have a public health nurse. The only sanitarian available is on the staff of the state health department with headquarters in Alamosa. His responsibilities extend to all six counties in the valley (Mineral included), so that he does not have the time to make sanitation inspections of migrant housing, unless a complaint is made.

Employment Department Inspections. The employment department inspected 467 housing units in the San Luis Valley in 1962. Growers refused to allow the department to make inspections at seven locations. Only 34 of the 467 units were found to be poor or unacceptable. Table 29 shows the number of inspections made by the department in the Alamosa and Monte Vista areas and the condition of the housing as determined by department personnel.

TABLE 29

State Department of Employment
Housing Inspections, San Luis Valley, 1962

	Area Office		
	Alamosa	Monte Vista	Total
Number of Inspections	160	307	467
Good	84	220	304
Fair	61	68	129
Poor	13	16	29
Not Acceptable	2	3	5
Inspection Prohibited	2	5	7

Health Programs and Needs

Health service for migrants was provided from 1956 through 1959 on an on-again-off-again basis. In 1956, a migrant nurse was available during potato harvest, and the same nurse was employed throughout the 1957 growing season. A migrant nurse was employed during part of the 1958 and all of the 1959 growing seasons. The migrant health program was carried on under the supervision of the local medical society, because the valley does not have an organized health unit. No arrangements were made for a migrant nurse program during the 1960 growing season apparently because of a misunderstanding between valley growers and the state health department. The department did not try to recruit a nurse for the program, because it received no indication from valley growers that services were desired. The growers did not contact the department because they assumed that there would be a nurse available as a matter of course.[7]

There was no migrant health program in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 and 1962 growing seasons, largely because of recruitment problems. The director of the Child Health Services Division, State Department of Public Health (who administers the migrant health program) has commented that while there is a need for a health program during the growing season, the biggest need is for organized health service on a 12-month basis.[8]

Occupational Health. No study has been made of occupational health problems in the San Luis Valley, but the sanitarian reported several cases of poisoning from insecticides during the 1960 and 1961 growing seasons.

---

[7] Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee, Minutes of Meeting of August 15, 1960.

[8] Ibid.

Education and Welfare

Migrant Schools

There were three migrant summer schools operated in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 growing season, but only one during 1962, for reasons which will be explained below. In 1961, two of the three schools were located in Costilla County -- one at San Luis and the other at the Sierra Grande Consolidated School near Blanca. Ninety to 100 youngsters were enrolled in each one of these schools. The other school was located in Monte Vista and had 30 pupils.

Costilla County. While there were some out-of-state migrants enrolled in the two Costilla county schools, most of them were from families who live in the county but who (according to the Costilla County Superintendent of Schools) travel to other areas to seek employment during a portion of the regular school year, and as a result their children either miss all or part of the regular school year.

During the field study, an effort was made to find out how many families with children enrolled in the special summer program actually migrated to other areas during any part of the regular school sessions. The results of this survey were inconclusive but indicated that the families of some of these children did not leave the county, at least during the regular school year.

Monte Vista. In Monte Vista, the youngsters enrolled in the summer school program were from families, or portions thereof, who had dropped out of the migrant stream at one time or another and now live in Lariat on the west outskirts of Monte Vista. Most of these families have numerous children and are without an adult male member; consequently, they receive Aid to Dependent Children. These youngsters are extremely retarded, and their families take little, if any, interest in their school attendance or progress.

1962 Summer Program. During the 1962 growing season, the only migrant school in operation in the valley was located at San Luis and had an estimated enrollment of 180. The other two schools did not operate, because the children who had been enrolled do not come within the definition of House Bill 410 (1961) which provided for state financial support of the migrant school program. A migrant agricultural worker is defined as, "an individual engaged in agricultural labor in this state who is residing in a school district which is not his regular domicile during the performance of this labor."[9] A migrant child is defined as, "a child of school age who is in the custody of migrant agricultural workers, whether or not they are his parents."[10] Therefore, had these schools continued to operate, it would have been at local rather than state expense. Prior to the passage of House Bill 410 (1961), state aid for migrant summer schools was provided by the State Board of Education from the state school contingency fund, and this fund could be allocated under formulae and rules established by the board; consequently, state aid was provided, even though some of the children's families were domiciled in the county.

---

[9] Chapter 223, Section 2(c), Session Laws of Colorado, 1961.

[10] Chapter 223, Section 2(b), Session Laws of Colorado, 1961.

Regular School Attendance

Only one school district in the San Luis Valley reported that migrant children were attending during the regular 1961-1962 school year. This district is located in Costilla County and had 45 migrant children in attendance for part of the regular school term.

As a general practice, the schools in the San Luis Valley are closed during potato harvest. There have been a number of criticisms of this practice, especially by educators who feel that the time lost by the children in the area is never really made up by the end of the school year. Further, they feel that the closing of schools during this period denies educational opportunities to migrant children as well as those who are residents. It is their opinion that children should be in school rather than working in the fields or left unsupervised.[11]

Those who support the closing of schools point out that:

1) The potato harvest provides an opportunity for a large number of families to make enough money to help them get through the winter. It is usually necessary for as many family members as are able to work in order to make a sufficient amount of money.

2) If they did not have this opportunity, many families would lack sufficient funds to send their children to school at all.

3) If children were not allowed to work because the schools are open, many families would not come to the valley to pick potatoes, and a labor shortage and crop loss would result.

An acceptable solution to this problem may develop in time through the mechanization of the potato harvest. Those growers who have mechanized their harvest operations usually limit their labor crews to adult members (over the age of 16) because of the potential safety hazards from having young children working around machinery. Mechanization also reduces labor needs substantially, so that eventually it may not be so necessary to have a large number of outside workers.

Migrant Attitude Toward Education for Their Children

The migrants interviewed in the San Luis Valley were asked the number of years of formal education which they would like their children to have. These answers were correlated with the number of years of formal education obtained by the interviewee, and the results are shown in Table 30.

---

11. For further discussions of this point of view, see Survey of San Luis Valley School Closures, Alfred M. Potts, State Department of Education, Denver, 1960 and Providing Education for Migrant Children, Alfred M. Potts, Colorado State Department of Education, Denver, 1961.

TABLE 30

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Luis Valley, 1961

Migrant's Years of School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend: 5	8	9	11	12	12+	Other[a]	Total
0	1	3			12		4	20
1		1			2			3
2					1			1
3		1			6	1	2	10
4		1			7	1	1	10
5		1			7		2	10
6					8		2	10
7		2			5	4	2	13
8		2	1		15	3	2	23
9					6	1		7
10					2	2		4
11				1	1		1	3
12					2	2	1	5
Total	1	11	1	1	74	14	17	119

a. This category includes the following responses: "as much as possible," "as much as they want," and "as much as we can afford."

Sixty-three per cent of those interviewed were of the opinion that their children should have a high school education, and an additional 12 per cent felt that their children should attend college. Only one migrant felt that less than an eighth grade education would be satisfactory for his children. Thirteen per cent of those interviewed felt that formal education was desirable and necessary, but, instead of stating a specific number of years, gave replies such as, "as much as possible," "as much as they want," or "as much as we can afford."

Welfare

Other than provision of surplus commodities, none of the county welfare departments in the San Luis Valley have provided any emergency assistance for migrants and their families. The welfare directors of the valley counties stated that they do not have sufficient general assistance funds available to provide such assistance and added that they have sufficient financial problems taking care of their resident welfare cases. It is their opinion that they are already providing assistance through A.D.C. (Aid to Dependent Children) to migrant families who have been deserted by their adult male members.

The Migrant

Number of Interviews

Two hundred and fifty-three interviews were conducted with migrant workers in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 growing season. One hundred and four of these interviews took place during the early season labor peak (July-August) and 149 during the late season labor peak (September-October).

Five different ethnic groups were included in these interviews: Spanish-American, Indian, Filipino, Negro, and Anglo. In determining the number of interviews with each ethnic group, consideration was given to the approximate proportion each group was of the total number of migrant workers in the area at the time the interviews were made.

These 253 interviews covered 428 workers, including 63 children under the age of 16 years. The total number of people represented by these interviews was 767. Table 31 shows, by ethnic group, the total number of interviews and the number of workers and people represented by them.

TABLE 31

Number of Migrant Interviews and Related Information By Ethnic Group, San Luis Valley, 1961

		Number of Workers				
Ethnic Group	Number of Interviews	Males Over 16	Females Over 16	Children Under 16	Total	Total Number of People
Spanish-American	168	187	71	60	318	615
Indian	50	49	21	1	71	101
Filipino	27	27	0	2	29	36
Negro	7	7	0	0	7	9
Anglo	1	3	0	0	3	6
Total	253	273	92	63	428	767

The Migrant Generally--A Profile

These composite migrant profiles cover the family and single workers of three ethnic groups: Spanish-American, Filipino, and Indian. No profiles were made for the Negroes and Anglos interviewed because they were so few as to make generalizations meaningless.

Spanish-American -- Married. The married Spanish-American migrant working in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 season, in most cases, calls either Texas or New Mexico his home state. If he worked in the valley during the early season peak, it is most likely that his home state is New Mexico. If he comes from a state other than New Mexico, it is either Texas or Arizona. If he worked during potato harvest, the chances are three to two that his home state is Texas rather than New Mexico.

The average Spanish-American migrant is between 27 and 32 years of age, and his wife is a few years younger. He and his wife have four or five children. He had been a migrant worker for eight years prior to the 1961 season and had worked in Colorado two or three years prior to 1961. He is working as a farm laborer because he has no other job skills and would otherwise be unemployed. Generally, he likes to work in Colorado and will return the following season. Wages, types of crops, and good treatment by employers are the major reasons why he likes to work in this state. If he does not like working in Colorado and does not plan to return, wages and housing are the chief reasons.

If he is in the San Luis Valley during the early season peak, he most likely obtained his employment either by asking around or by returning to a grower for whom he had worked previously. If he is working during potato harvest, the chances are he is employed by a grower for whom he worked previously or that he obtained his job through a crew leader.

He and his family probably came to the valley in July but may have come in June, if he is working during the early season peak. He will work in the valley from two to three months before leaving. Before coming to the valley, he worked in New Mexico in most cases. (Arizona, California, Texas, and Idaho are other states he may have worked in before coming to Colorado.) If he intended to work after leaving Colorado, Arizona, California, Texas, and New Mexico were the most likely states in which he would seek employment. It cost him and his family between $15 and $22 to come to Colorado. In most instances, he came by car, but, in a few cases, he came by truck. The chances are four to one that he provided the transportation for himself and his family. In the other instances, he traveled with relatives or friends.

If he and his family came to the valley for potato harvest, they probably arrived in the latter part of September. The chances are one in two that he didn't work prior to coming to Colorado. If he had been employed, he probably worked in Texas, but other possible states include New Mexico, Alabama, Ohio, Michigan, and North Dakota. Most likely he had no other work plans after the conclusion of potato harvest, but, if he did, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and Florida (in that order) were the probable states where he would seek employment. It cost him and his family between $20 and $25 to come to Colorado. In most cases, he provided his own transportation and was just as likely to have traveled by truck as by car. In a number of instances, however, he and his family traveled with relatives or friends.

Spanish-American -- Single. The average Spanish-American solo worker in the San Luis Valley during the early season peak in 1961 was in his early 30's. The average single worker during potato harvest is more likely to be between 18 and 22 years of age. His home state is either New Mexico or Texas (applies to both early and late season workers). The early season single Spanish-American worker had been a seasonal farm laborer for five years prior to the 1961 growing season and had worked in Colorado two years. The late season single Spanish-American worker had been a seasonal farm worker for two years prior to the 1961 growing season, and the chances are good that he worked in Colorado during both years. He is working as a seasonal farm laborer because of a lack of other skills and formal education.

Generally, he likes to work in Colorado and plans to return during the following season. Wages and the type of crop are the chief reasons why he will return. In the few instances where he dislikes working in Colorado and does not plan to return, wages and housing (in that order) are listed as the reasons. If he has come for early season employment, he probably worked previously in either Texas, New Mexico, or California. His previous state of employment prior to potato harvest was probably Texas, but he may have worked in Alabama, Florida, Ohio, Michigan, or Idaho. Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, and California were listed by early season single workers as probable states of employment after leaving Colorado. Single Spanish-Americans working during potato harvest indicated Texas as the most likely state in which employment would be sought. Other possibilities included Wyoming and Florida.

The single worker employed during the early season peak probably obtained his job by asking around or through a grower, perhaps the same one who employed him in the previous season; however, he may have gotten his job through a crew leader or contractor. He came to Colorado by car and either came alone or traveled with relatives or friends. In either case, it cost him approximately $15 to get here.

The single Spanish-American worker employed during potato harvest either got his job through arrangements made by an employer, by returning to a grower for whom he worked previously, or through a crew leader. He came to Colorado either by car or truck. While he may have come by himself, it is more likely that he traveled with relatives or friends. It cost him between $8 and $10 to come to Colorado.

Filipino. The average married Filipino lettuce worker in the San Luis Valley in 1961 was between 45 and 50 years old. The average single Filipino worker was likely to have been a few years older.[12] Both married and single workers on the average had followed the lettuce harvest for 12 years prior to the 1961 growing season. They had worked in Colorado, however, only two or three years. Those workers who were married, divorced, or widowed had an average of three children. California or Arizona was most likely to have been the home state of the Filipino workers. Prior to coming to Colorado, most of them had worked in California, but a few had been employed in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. After completion of the lettuce harvest in the San Luis Valley, Arizona would most likely be the next state of employment, but California, New Mexico, and Texas (in that order) were other possibilities. The type of crop and wages were given as the main reasons why they preferred to work in Colorado and planned to return during the following season. The one worker who would not return listed wages and housing as the reasons.

Indian. Almost all the Indians interviewed were Navajos from the reservations in New Mexico and Arizona. The others were Pueblo Indians from New Mexico. The average married Indian working in the 1961 potato harvest was in his late 30's. The average single Indian worker was in his early 20's. The married Indian had been a seasonal farm laborer for two years prior to the 1961 growing season and the single Indian for one. In both instances, the number of previous years worked in Colorado was the same as the number of years as a seasonal farm laborer. The married Indian worker and those single workers who were divorced or widowed had between four and five children.

---

[12] Most of these single workers were either divorced or widowed.

Most of the Indian workers (both married and single) had not been employed prior to coming to Colorado and they did not intend to seek further employment off the reservation after completion of potato harvest. The few that had been employed previously and who would seek further employment had worked and planned to work in either Arizona or New Mexico. Almost all of them liked to work in Colorado and planned to return the following season. The type of crop and wages were listed as the chief reasons. The few who did not plan to return objected to the wages and housing.

Statistical Information. The following tables contain some of the information upon which the above profiles were based:

TABLE 32

Years As a Migrant Worker
By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment,
San Luis Valley, 1961

	Early Season						Late Season						Total		
	Family			Single			Family			Single					
Years	F	SA	T	F	SA	T	I	SA	T	I	SA	T	F	I	SA
0		2	2												2
1		6	6				8	7	15	9	7	16		17	20
2		3	3		1	1	6	8	14	3	6	9		9	18
3	1	5	6		5	5	1	4	5	1	5	6	1	2	19
4		3	3		1	1	3	3	6	1	3	4		4	10
5	1	1	2	2	3	5		4	4	2	1	3	3	2	9
6	1	2	3					6	6	1	5	6	1	1	13
7	1	4	5		2	2	1	1	2		1	1	1	1	8
8		3	3	1		1		1	1		1	1	1		5
9		3	3	2		2		3	3				2		6
10	2	8	10	1		1		2	2	1	1	2	3	1	11
11-15		6	6	3	2	5	3	6	9				3	3	14
16-20	2	5	7	1		1	1	6	7				3	1	11
21-25		2	2				1	4	5					1	6
26-30	2		2	1		1		2	2				3		2
31+	3	1	4	1		1	3	5	8	1	1	2	4	4	7
NK	2	3	5		1	1	4	3	7				2	4	7
Total	15	57	72	12	15	27	31	65	96	19	31	50	27	50	168

NK - Not known
F - Filipino
SA- Spanish-American
I - Indian
T - Total

TABLE 33

Years As a Migrant Worker in Colorado By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961

	Early Season						Late Season						Total		
	Family			Single			Family			Single					
Years	F	SA	T	F	SA	T	I	SA	T	I	SA	T	F	I	SA
0	1	4	5	3	1	4							4		5
1	3	13	16	4	1	5	15	16	31	12	9	21	7	27	39
2	2	7	9	1	2	3	9	18	27	3	6	9	3	12	33
3	3	4	7	2	3	5	1	7	8	2	4	6	5	3	18
4	2	3	5		2	2	3	4	7		3	3	2	3	12
5	2	1	3	1	2	3		5	5	1	1	2	3	1	9
6	1	1	2	1		1		3	3		4	4	2		8
7		2	2				1	2	3		1	1		1	5
8		2	2					1	1		1	1			4
9		1	1					1	1						2
10		4	4					1	1	1		1		1	5
11-15		3	3		1	1	2	3	5		1	1		2	8
16-20		1	1					3	3						4
21-25															
26-30	1		1										1		
31+								1	1		1	1			2
NK		11	11		3	3									14
Total	15	57	72	12	15	27	31	65	96	19	31	50	27	50	168

NK - Not known
F - Filipino
SA- Spanish-American
I - Indian
T - Total

TABLE 34

Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or Not Work in Colorado, By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961

	Wages		Housing		Type of Crops		Length of Season		Treatment by Grower		Community Attitude		Weather		Other	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Early Season																
Spanish-American																
Family	20	6	12	2	9				9		5				9	2
Single	7		1		5				1							2
Total	27	6	13	2	14				10		5				9	4
Filipino																
Family	5		3		10				1		3				2	
Single	4	1	2	1	6				3		3				1	
Total	9	1	5	1	16				4		6				3	
Late Season																
Spanish-American																
Family	17	2		5	24				8		2				24	2
Single	5	4		3	11						2				8	1
Total	22	6		8	35				8		4				32	3
Indian																
Family	1	3		1	7						1				15	2
Single	3	1		1	4				2		1				4	2
Total	4	4		2	11				2		2				19	4
Total[a]	62	17	18	13	76				24		17				63	11

a. Both seasons and all ethnic groups, family and single.

TABLE 35

Areas To Which Migrants Expected To Travel To Find Employment After Leaving the San Luis Valley, By Ethnic Group, 1961

State	Spanish-American			Filipino			Indian		
	Family	Single	Total	Family	Single	Total	Family	Single	Total
Arizona	11	3	14	11	5	16	2		2
California	3	1	4	4	5	9			
Florida	1	1	2						
Kansas		1	1						
New Mexico	17	3	20	2	4	6	2	5	7
Texas	34	8	42	3	2	5			
Washington					1	1			
Return to Home State or Area	59	29	88				27	14	41

The Migrant and the Community

There are no organized programs for domestic migrants in the San Luis Valley, nor is there any group specifically interested in the migrant and his problems. (It should be noted, however, that in some respects the problems of migrant workers and their families are not much different from those of some of the valley's residents.) While there have been no programs for migrants, efforts were made in the Alamosa area in 1961 to provide entertainment for Mexican nationals. Free Saturday night movies for braceros were sponsored by the Alamosa Chamber of Commerce. They were terminated after four weeks, according to a chamber of commerce official, because of a lack of interest on the part of the braceros. The chamber of commerce had four goals in establishing this program for nationals, including: 1) promotion of the Good Neighbor policy; 2) countering of any communist activity; 3) promotion of trade with local merchants; and 4) provision of entertainment for these foreign workers.

The Council of Churches Migrant Ministry had hoped to have a worker in the valley during the 1961 growing season, but had been unable to recruit anyone for this position. According to newspaper reports, a program is in the process of being developed for the San Luis Valley, but no details are available.

During the past few years, Adams State College has been conducting annual workshops for educators who work with migrant children. A different phase of migrant education has been stressed each year; in 1961, the emphasis was on language arts. The workshop leaders and faculty have been selected on a national basis, and educators have come from many states to attend. Starting with the 1962-1963 academic year, this program is being expanded, with the major emphasis on bilingual education. The full-time director of the new Adams State program is the former head of the state department of education's migrant research project.

Law Enforcement

Chamber of commerce officials in Alamosa and Monte Vista were of the opinion that domestic migrants, especially the Filipino lettuce workers, created a considerable law enforcement problem because of drinking and disorderly conduct. The police officials in Alamosa, Monte Vista, and Center stated that there was very little trouble caused by domestic migrants, and the Filipinos caused no trouble at all. They added, however, that there were occasional problems during potato harvest with domestic workers because of excessive drinking. They also said that Mexican nationals caused no particular law enforcement problems. These were the attitudes expressed by the mayor of Center, who said that most of the problems were caused by local residents.

THE WESTERN SLOPE

Crop Activities and Acreage

The Western Slope area as defined in this study includes the fruit growing areas around Grand Junction, Palisade, and Delta and the hay, grain, tomato, and sugar beet areas from Montrose to Grand Junction. All of the area included in the study is irrigated.

Crops Using Seasonal Labor

Grand Junction Area. The crops for which seasonal farm labor is needed in the Grand Junction area include: peaches, cherries, pears, apples, tomatoes, and sugar beets. The largest number of seasonal workers, by far, are needed during peach harvest, which usually begins the third or fourth week of August and is largely concluded within 10 to 12 days. Table 36 shows the number of farms growing fruit in Mesa County in 1959 (latest figures available).

TABLE 36

1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Mesa County[a]

Fruit	No. of Farms	Quantity Harvested
Apricots	364	43,129 bushels
Apples	282	50,926 bushels
Sour Cherries	177	311,496 pounds
Sweet Cherries	219	169,955 pounds
Peaches	689	1,241,887 bushels
Pears	228	138,536 bushels
Plums and Prunes	186	9,561 bushels

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final, 1960 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1961.

In addition to these fruit crops, there were 3,609 acres of sugar beets harvested in Mesa County in 1961, with a yield of 81,226 tons.[1] This yield was approximately 3.3 per cent of the total state sugar beet production. Average yield per acre of sugar beets in Mesa County in 1961 was 22.5 tons, the highest county yield in the state and considerably above the state average yield of 14.7 tons per acre.

Mesa County had 50 acres of commercial tomatoes harvested in 1960.[1] No information is available on the yield of tomatoes harvested.

Delta Area. The Delta area produces the same crops as the Grand Junction area for which seasonal farm labor is needed. Table 37 shows the number of farms growing fruit in the Delta County area in 1959.

---

[1] Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1962.

TABLE 37

1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Delta County [a]

Fruit	No. of Farms	Quantity Harvested
Apricots	187	25,016 bushels
Apples	393	533,004 bushels
Sour Cherries	114	249,496 pounds
Sweet Cherries	181	468,529 pounds
Peaches	318	248,128 bushels
Pears	150	52,769 bushels
Plums and Prunes	160	21,028 bushels

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final, Colorado Department of Agriculture.

Delta County also harvested 685 acres of sugar beets in 1961, for a production of 12,825 tons. The yield on sugar beets was 18.7 tons per acre,[2] second only to Mesa County in yield per acre and well above the state average.

Delta and Montrose counties harvested 660 acres of onions in 1960,[3] with the bulk of this acreage in Montrose County.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

During the ten-year period, 1950-1960, the number of bearing peach trees in Mesa County declined from 636,354 to 496,274. The production in bushels during the same period decreased slightly from 1,282,991 to 1,241,857 bushels. This difference might have been caused by weather and climatic conditions. Production, however, increased .49 bushels per tree, or 24.3 per cent more than in 1950.

The number of bearing apple trees in Delta County decreased during the 1950-1960 period from 215,534 to 177,527. The production in bushels of apples also decreased from 983,635 to 533,004, and production per tree decreased more than a bushel and a half.

Table 38 shows the difference between 1950-1960 in the total number of farms in Mesa County growing peaches, the farms in Delta County growing apples, the average number of trees per farm, and the per cent change in number of farms and in trees per farm.

---

[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

TABLE 38

Number of Mesa County Farms Growing Peaches and Number of Trees,
Number of Delta County Farms Growing Apples and Number of Trees,
1950-1960

	No. of Farms		Pct. of Change	Average Number of Trees Per Farm		Pct. of Change
	1950	1960		1950	1960	
Mesa	1279	689	-46.1%	497	720	+44.8%
Delta	667	363	-45.6%	323	489	+51.4%

Mechanization and Technological Change

There has been little success in mechanizing the fruit harvest on the Western Slope except for picking cherries. A spokesman for the only fruit processing plant in the area said that two mechanical cherry harvesters had cut their need for cherry pickers by fifty per cent and had reduced the per unit cost for labor from $3.00 to $.57. This company plans to mechanize fully the cherry harvest as soon as possible.

So far as could be determined, there was no mechanical peach picking during the 1961 season, although several machines for this operation have been developed and used in other states. Thinning of the peach crop is now performed to a considerable extent through the use of spray applications while the trees are in bloom and by mechanical shaking after the fruit has set. Growers who do not spray or shake the trees resort to hand thinning in order to insure a quality product.

One of the major factors which seems to be blocking the development and use of mechanical harvesters on the Western Slope is the small size of most of the farms. Few farms have enough bearing trees to make the purchase and use of a mechanical harvester economically feasible.

Mechanization in the pre-harvest activities in sugar beets is not far advanced. An interview with Holly Sugar Company officials confirmed that no monogerm seed is planted on the Western Slope, because of the stronger disease resistant qualities of the segmented seed beet plants. The use of segmented seed requires the use of hand labor almost exclusively in blocking and thinning operations. Most of the workers in pre-harvest activities in sugar beets are Mexican nationals, although there are some Navajo Indians so employed.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

The fruit grower is faced with the problem of obtaining a large supply of labor on short notice to be used for only a short period. This situation makes it difficult to attract well-qualified, able workers. Many workers who are already in other areas of Colorado hesitate to go to the fruit harvest because of the short harvest season. The normal time for the peach harvest to begin is about the third week of August, but a change in the weather can advance or delay this date by several days. If the workers are in the area and the fruit is not ready, many may leave the area completely and cause a labor shortage. If the fruit is ready and workers are not available to harvest it, severe economic loss can be sustained by the growers. The fruit grower is constantly faced with the possibility of having either too much labor or not enough.

Another problem facing peach growers on the Western Slope is the small size of their orchards. With rising labor and material costs, a small acreage is not an efficient economic unit. The most recent figures available show the average farm has 720 trees. The average per tree yield in 1959 was 2.5 bushels, or 1,800 bushels per farm. An average price for two recent years, 1959-1961, was $2.77 per bushel. Consequently, the average sized peach orchard could realize a gross of $4,986. From this gross must be paid all costs of rent, taxes, depreciation, labor, supplies, water, etc.

Some farmers have expressed concern because the type of people who come to pick peaches is changing. For a number of years, many family units came to the peach areas to help pick peaches and at the same time can enough peaches for the family's winter use. These workers were steady and dependable and stayed until the harvest was completed. In recent years, fewer of these family groups have come to pick peaches, and their ranks are being filled by solo, itinerant workers or by large, contract labor groups. Both of the latter type of workers are more likely to leave the area before the harvest is completed, if a sudden change of weather slows down or stops picking for a few days.

The attitude of the Western Slope growers is that the migrant worker is a very necessary and important part of the fruit growing process and that some allowances must be made for the unreliable or inefficient worker in order to assure that the crop will be harvested. There is a general feeling in the area that better housing, health, and other facilities must be provided so that the area will be able to attract enough qualified workers to pick the peach crop.

Liquor consumption was cited by several growers as a main cause of unreliability of the migrant worker, but this problem does not seem to be as widespread among the workers as a group as it is in the San Juan Basin.

Pertinent Economic Conditions

Sugar Factory. During the 1960-61 growing season, considerable anxiety was caused in the sugar beet growing areas of the Western Slope over the Holly Sugar Company's decision to shut down the Delta sugar processing plant. Had this decision been carried out, it would have seriously disrupted the economic base of many farmers in the area.

During the winter of 1961-62, discussions were held throughout the region to see what could be done to keep the Delta processing plant in operation. The company officials revealed that they would consider keeping the plant operating, if funds for modernizing the plant were made available. Accordingly, many of the beet growing farmers jointly raised part of the money to put the plant into first class operating condition during the summer of 1962. The future of the beet sugar industry in western Colorado now seems assured for several years.

The beet growing farmers of Mesa, Delta, and Montrose counties agreed to loan Holly Sugar Company $200,000 and to increase the sugar beet acreage in the three counties from the 6,000 acres grown in 1961 to 8,000 acres in 1962, with an increase of 1,000 additional acres per year in 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. The company agreed to pay the loan back in equal installments of $40,000 per year, plus five per cent interest, and to pay a bonus of 25 cents per ton if 170,000 tons of beets per year averaging 16 per cent sugar content were delivered to the Delta mill during the five years the $200,000 loan was outstanding.

Proposed Winery. A recent proposal has been submitted to the fruit growers in the Palisade and Grand Junction areas to consider the establishment of a winery and distillery to process fruit which does not meet necessary standards for shipping to fresh markets out of the area. This winery and distillery would make brandy, nectar, cordials and other beverages. So far as can be determined, plans for this facility have not yet been fully developed. Development of this winery and distillery would create a market for the 10 to 15 per cent of the fruit crop that is discarded because it is not good enough to be placed on the fresh market.

Canneries. There are two canning plants on the Western Slope. One of these plants is located in Delta and packs apples, cherries, apricots, and peaches. The company raises some of its fruit but purchases most of it from other growers. A company spokesman said that the company would process more fruit, but the plant has only a 5,000-6,000 bushels per day capacity on peaches. The entire season's peach canning output, therefore, is limited to about 85,000 bushels. This is about seven per cent of the 1959 peach production, which was considered a fairly normal yield.

The other canning plant is the Kuner-Empson plant in Grand Junction. The only product processed through this plant is tomatoes. All of the tomatoes processed at the Grand Junction plant are grown locally, with the heaviest planting of tomatoes being in the Fruita-Loma region.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers -- Peak Employment

There is not much employment of seasonal farm labor prior to the second or third week in May. From the third week of May through the first half of June between 500 and 800 seasonal farm workers are employed. Employment during this period consists primarily of tomato planting and sugar beet pre-harvest work. An early season peak is reached toward the end of June, with some 1,100 to 1,300 workers employed in 1962. The major activities at this time are peach pre-harvest (thinning) and sugar beet pre-harvest work. These two activities employed 60 per cent of the seasonal farm workers around Grand Junction in the fourth week of June, 1962. Some workers are employed in cherry and apricot harvests at this time, also. The number of employed workers usually drops to 800 or less by the third or fourth week in July and to 500 or less during the first two weeks of August.

The late season peak is reached during peach harvest, which usually begins the third or fourth week of August and continues for 10 to 12 days. Pear harvest is also carried on during this period, as is tomato harvest. Tomato harvest usually continues until late September or early October.

In 1962, the following seasonal farm labor totals were reported for late August and early September by the employment department:

Week	Total Workers	Workers in Peaches	Per Cent of Total Workers in Peaches
3rd August	715	110	15.4%
4th August	5,900	5,340	90.5%
5th August	5,340	4,700	88.0%
1st September	1,505	530	35.8%

After the completion of peach harvest, employment of seasonal farm workers drops rapidly. During the remainder of September and October, the main activities are tomato harvest and the harvesting of the remaining late fruit crops.

Recent Trends. Employment figures for the past four years show peak employment totals in peaches varied between 1,700 in 1960 and 5,500 in 1959, with peak employment in 1961 and 1962 being 4,850 and 5,340 workers, respectively. The great difference in 1960 was caused by a very poor crop of peaches, so that very little harvest labor was required. During normal crop years, the number of workers needed annually during the high peak employment period has varied less than 12 per cent. The dominant factor in determining the size of the work force has been the size of the peach crop.

Longer Range Trends. The 1957 to 1962 period shows a decrease in the total number of workers being used in peach harvest. In 1957, total employment in peaches was 5,900, and the 1962 total was 5,340. The changing pattern in the type of worker being used in the peach harvest may account for this difference, assuming that crop yields remain fairly constant. In 1957, the employment department reported that adult, contract crews were used for the first time on a large scale. The use of these crews has increased from year to year, replacing many of the family group pickers who used to constitute a large proportion of the total workers.

Mexican Nationals. Mexican nationals are not used in any of the fruit producing activities on the Western Slope. The use of nationals is confined mostly to two crops, sugar beets and tomatoes. The peak use of Mexican nationals occurred during the third week of May in 1962, when 392 were reported in the Grand Junction-Fruita area, most, if not all, of them being in sugar beets. This was an increase of 152 workers over the same period in 1961 and an increase of 183 over 1960. Late season peak use of nationals to harvest tomatoes was 223 workers during the second week of September, 1962, which was 35 more workers than were used in 1961 and 93 more than were used in 1960 for the comparable period.

Employment Department Statistics. The number of workers reported in the Grand Junction area by the employment department is probably one of the most accurate estimates made in the state. The high concentration of workers in a relatively small area lends itself to ease of counting and estimating. Also, the employment department maintains an office in Palisade, along with the Peach Board of Control, and is in daily contact with many of the growers during the harvest season.

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment

Peaches. The main efforts of the employment department and the Peach Control Board are directed to the provision of an adequate labor supply for peach harvest. According to the executive secretary of the Peach Control Board and the employment department field representatives, the initial planning takes place early in the spring. The peach board and the employment department estimate the number of workers who will be needed during peach harvest and the number of locals who will be available. Then recruitment activities are planned, aimed at bringing in a sufficient quantity of outside workers. The employment department works with the employment departments of several other states (Arizona, Arkansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, primarily). The peach board also advertises for workers in newspapers throughout the state and in surrounding states.

Many workers return annually as a matter of course and often are employed by the same growers. A number of growers make arrangements for crews directly with contractors in other states. The crews who are recruited in other states through the joint efforts of the departments of employment in Colorado and other states usually know the grower for whom they will work prior to their arrival in Colorado.

The Department of Employment has an office in the Peach Control Board building in Palisade and staffs this office with two field men who work closely with the board. During the peach harvest period, these employment department staff members keep track of workers as they arrive and check to see if they go to work for the growers as arranged. Their only other major task during this period appears to be the assignment of workers who arrive without prior agreements. These workers are allocated according to the labor shortages reported by the growers.

Using the experience of a several-year period, the Peach Board of Control has determined that a picker will harvest about 225 bushels of peaches during the season and uses this figure to estimate the number of pickers needed. For instance, in early 1961, the peach crop was estimated at about 1,200,000 bushels. The number of workers needed for harvesting a crop of this size would, therefore, be about 5,300. The actual number of workers employed at the peak of the harvest in 1961 was 4,850. However, several days of rainy weather during the harvest may have caused some of the workers to leave the area without staying to finish, which decreased the total number available.

The employment department applies to all of the local employment offices in Colorado for available labor before it asks help from other states. Local labor is used extensively in the packing sheds.

Scheduled contract crews are being used more and more with good results. These crews are not so apt to arrive several days too early as are the individual workers or the unscheduled crews and family groups.

The Peach Board of Control advertises extensively throughout Colorado and surrounding states in order to attract workers for the peach harvest. Some questions have been raised as to the effectiveness of this advertising campaign. In 1961, for example, there was no advertising placed in the metropolitan areas of Colorado, because it was felt that workers from these areas were less reliable than other workers. Staff interviews during the 1961 field study showed that few workers, if any, came to the harvest because of any advertising offered by the board. Most workers not members of an organized crew said they came because: 1) they had been there before; 2) they came with a friend or family; or 3) they "just knew about" the peaches in western Colorado.

Other Crops. Recruiting for workers for crops other than peaches is done by the employment department or by individual growers. The employment department attempts to utilize all local and intrastate workers before it asks for workers from other states. If workers from other states cannot be found, Mexican nationals are certified for use. The main sources of labor from out of state are Spanish-Americans from Texas and New Mexico and Navajos from New Mexico and Arizona.

Most of the pre-harvest work in peaches and the harvest activities of other fruit is done by local labor or other labor that has come into the area in advance of the peach harvest. The workers in hay are primarily from local sources, with some from other areas of Colorado.

Utilization and Reallocation

From 1947 to 1961, the Peach Board of Control operated the migrant housing camp at Palisade. This camp did not operate in 1962 and has been abandoned and the buildings sold.

While the camp was in operation it was an effective staging area and relocation center for workers who came to the area without work commitments. The manager of the camp could keep in daily contact with the board and with the employment department and could refer workers to those farmers who needed labor.

The employment department operates two offices during peach harvest; one at the main office in Grand Junction and another with the Board of Control in Palisade. These two offices give fairly effective control of utilization by directing workers to farmers with known labor needs. Workers who finish a harvest for one farmer can obtain information about further job opportunities at either office.

The employment department tries to direct workers to other employment in Colorado once they have finished the peach harvest. Little success is obtained from these efforts, however. The employment department reports that many of the workers could move to the Hotchkiss-Paonia area and pick apples, but few do because of colder temperatures and the poor housing available there. Some workers are successfully referred to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest, however. There appear to be two factors which reduce the effectiveness of the department's reallocation efforts. One is that the contract crews may have commitments to perform in other states and, therefore, cannot stay in Colorado, even though work is readily available. The other is that the family groups return home immediately after peach harvest in order to get the children into school.

Reallocation. It is estimated from the migrant questionnaire that possibly 21 per cent of the peach harvest workers might be available and interested in working elsewhere in Colorado, following completion of the harvest. In arriving at this proportion, all workers who had even the slightest reason for not staying were excluded. The application of this proportion to the total interstate migrant force during peach harvest results in an estimate of 600 workers. Nine per cent of the interstate migrants interviewed planned to stay in the area. until completion of apple harvest. Another ten per cent indicated that they would work in other areas in the state before returning home. Some were going to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest, others (mostly Cherokee Indians) were going to Baca County for broomcorn harvest, and still others were going to pick apples in Hotchkiss.

In computing the 21 per cent availability estimate, no crews brought in by contractors were included. It is interesting to note, however, that a few crews from Louisiana planned to remain for apple harvest in both the Palisade and Hotchkiss areas. Possibly, contractual arrangements covering apples were made at the same time as for peaches. If this is the case, it opens up new possibilities in the scheduling of workers. Perhaps more crews (especially since they travel long distances) might be willing to remain through apple harvest.

Table 39 on the following page shows the methods by which the workers reported finding a job on the Western Slope in 1961.

It should be pointed out that even though the individual workers reported that they obtained their jobs through the efforts of a crew leader or contractor; these leaders very often had contacted an employment department office either in Colorado or in their home state before coming to Colorado. Thus, the figures as presented above are not indicative of the part played by the employment department in recruiting or allocating workers.

TABLE 39

Method of Finding Job on Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Method of Finding Job	Family	Single	Total	Per Cent of Total Interviews
Colorado Employment Department	13	6	19	6.1%
Another State's Empl. Dept.			11	3.5
Arkansas	3	3		
Arizona	2	2		
Texas	1			
Return to Previous Employer	20	7	27	8.6
Through Labor Contractor	28	98	126	40.4
Through Crew Leaders	5	16	21	6.7
Arrangements by Employer	19	15	34	10.9
Just Asking Around	27	30	57	18.3
Other	7	10	17	5.4
Total	125	187	312	99.9%

States Worked In Previously. Table 40 on the following page shows the states worked in by the migrant before coming to western Colorado in 1961 as reported in the migrant interviews.

None of the workers interviewed had worked as a seasonal farm laborer in any other part of Colorado in 1961 before coming to the Western Slope for peach harvest. Some may have worked on the Western Slope in other crops before the beginning of peach harvest. At least 22 of the interviewees had arrived in the area several weeks to a month before the peach harvest began; most workers, however, did not arrive until middle or late August.

Many of the workers who reported that they did not work anywhere else before coming to the Western Slope are not true migrants. These people have steady jobs in other places and came to pick a few peaches as a sort of working vacation.

Employment after Peach Harvest. Table 41 gives an indication of migration and employment pattern after completion of the peach harvest. This table shows the state or Colorado area to which the worker intended to go and whether he intended to seek further employment in 1961.

Of the 51 family units interviewed, 30 said that they would seek employment in their home state. Seventy-six single workers said that they would seek further employment in 1961, and 42 of these reported that they would return to their home states to find jobs. Only one single worker planned to seek further employment in Colorado.

TABLE 40

State Worked In Prior To Coming To The Western Slope, Migrant Interviews 1961

Area or State	Family	Single	Total	Per Cent of Total Interviews
Alabama		1	1	.3%
Arkansas	8	19	27	8.6
Arkansas and Illinois	1		1	.3
Arkansas and Texas		2	2	.6
Arkansas and Wisconsin		1	1	.3
Arizona	2	19	21	6.7
Arizona and California		2	2	.6
Arizona and Nebraska	1		1	.3
Arizona and Oregon		1	1	.3
California	3	6	9	2.9
California and Texas	1		1	.3
California, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington	1		1	.3
Idaho	1	1	2	.6
Idaho and Utah		1	1	.3
Illinois		1	1	.3
Illinois and Ohio		1	1	.3
Kansas	2	3	5	1.6
Kansas, Ohio and Pennsylvania		1	1	.3
Louisiana		7	7	2.2
Michigan		1	1	.3
Nebraska		1	1	.3
New Mexico	3		3	.9
Ohio		1	1	.3
Oklahoma	8	8	16	5.1
Oklahoma and Texas	2	1	3	.9
Oregon	1		1	.3
South Carolina	1		1	.3
Texas	7	7	14	4.4
Utah		3	3	.9
Washington	1		1	.3
Wyoming	2	2	4	1.2
No other state	80	97	177	56.7
Total	125	187	312	99.0

TABLE 41

Travel and Work After Leaving Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961

Month Leaving Western Slope	State or Area Going To	Family		Single	
		will seek work	will not seek work	will seek work	will not seek work
August			3		6
	Arkansas			1	
	Idaho			1	
	Michigan			1	
	Oklahoma	1			
September			62		90
	Arkansas	9		12	
	Arizona	4		18	
	California	3		5	
	Idaho	1		3	
	Kansas	1		2	
	Louisiana			2	
	Nebraska			1	
	New Mexico	3		2	
	Ohio			1	
	Oklahoma	4		5	
	Texas	11		5	
	Utah	1			
	Washington	5		3	
	West Virginia			2	
	San Luis Valley			1	
October			2		4
	Arizona			1	
	California			2	
	Idaho	1			
	New Mexico			1	
	Texas	1			
November			3		1
	Arizona	1			
	Florida			1	
	Utah			1	
No Date Given			3		11
	Arizona			3	
	California	2			
	New Mexico	1			
	Oklahoma	1		2	
	Texas	1			
TOTAL		51	73	76	112

Wage Rates and Earnings

Wage rates for the 1961 peach harvest, as generally established by the Peach Board of Control prior to harvest, were $.11 per box, plus four cents bonus if the worker finished the harvest. Few farmers, however, refused to pay the four-cent bonus, even if a worker quit before finishing the harvest. Most workers who were working on piece rates were getting paid the full $.15 per box. Table 42 shows the wage rates being paid in 1961 during peach harvest to the 312 persons interviewed on the Western Slope.

TABLE 42

Wage Rates Received During Peach Harvest,
Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Rate	Number of Workers	
$.05½ box (shed worker)	1	
.11 box	1	
.12 box	1	
.15 box	53	
.16 box	1	
.17 box	2	
.18 box (pears)	1	
.20 box (pears)	2	
Piece rate total		62
$ .90 hour	2	
1.00 hour	209	
1.10 hour	7	
1.15 hour	6	
1.19 hour	1	
1.20 hour	1	
1.25 hour	14	
1.50 hour	3	
Hourly rate total		243
GRAND TOTAL		305[a]

a. Seven workers did not know their rate of pay or had not started to to work when interviewed.

The amount that each interviewee had earned during the previous week is shown in Table 43.

TABLE 43

Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants on the Western Slope, 1961[a]

	Anglo		Negro		Spanish-American		Indian	
	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single
Mean	$21.25	$26.91	$17.97	$15.31	$ 31.26	$19.81	$16.75	$13.25
Median	15.00	20.00	11.00	8.50	20.00	16.50	11.00	5.50
Low Earnings	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
High Earnings	98.00	77.00	92.00	78.00	120.00	72.00	45.00	50.00

a. Interviewees who had not been paid yet are not included.

The mean for all of the family groups was $22.86 and the median was $15.00. The mean weekly earnings for all of the single individuals interviewed was $18.98 and the median was $10.00. It should be noted that only a few workers were fully employed during the week surveyed, as the peach harvest did not get underway until the last few days.

Children of migrant families do not play an important role in peach harvest. Only 34 children from the 124 families interviewed were reported as working and adding to the family's earnings. Eight of the children working as part of a family group were Anglo; two were Negro; and 24 were Spanish-American.

Very few migrant wives work during peach harvest according to the results of the field survey. Only 33 wives from the 124 family units were found who had been working in the peach harvest. Eighteen of the women were Anglo; three were Negro; and 12 were Spanish-American.

Table 44 presents a breakdown of the average weekly earnings from April [illegible], 1961, until the time interviewed, as reported by the 312 interviewees.

TABLE 44

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Western Slope, 1961

	Anglo		Negro		Spanish-American		Indian	
	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single
Mean	$ 27.84	$23.18	$ 18.92	$ 8.52	$23.23	$19.94	$10.72	$14.97
Median	16.66	17.50	10.00	5.00	20.00	15.00	14.00	14.28
Low Average	00	00	00	00	1.50	00	3.75	00
High Average	115.00	72.50	120.00	40.50	71.43	80.00	14.40	45.00

The mean average weekly earnings since the first of April for all family groups was $23.52 and the median was $15.00. During the same period, all single workers had a mean average weekly wage of $14.63 and a median average weekly wage of $12.00.

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

Housing facilities for migrant workers have been considerably altered since the committee hearing and tour in Palisade and surrounding area on August 18 and 19, 1961, and the field survey conducted from August 18 to September 2, 1961. The Palisade camp, which was a staging area, as well as providing housing, has been abandoned.

Palisade Camp. The Palisade camp was owned by the Peach Board of Control and had been purchased from the federal government in 1948. The camp itself consisted of about 200 one-room wooden shelters, with central washing and shower facilities located in the community building but with no indoor plumbing facilities. The Palisade camp had become a source of controversy between different groups of growers on the Western Slope, and following the 1961 harvest, the decision was made to close the camp and dispose of the shelters to individual growers.

Recent articles in the Grand Junction Sentinel have shown that the closing of the Palisade camp has had an adverse effect. During the 1962 season, workers were again found camping along the river banks and under bridges. This situation had almost completely disappeared during the time the camp was operated. While sanitation facilities in the camp could have been improved, they were far superior to anything available for workers living along the river bank. The closing of the Palisade camp also may have been responsible, at least in part, for the decrease in family groups and the increase in solo workers.

The camp provided: 1) a centrally-located headquarters to assist workers to find on-the-farm housing; 2) central housing area before on-the-farm housing was ready; and 3) longer-term housing for those workers who could not find on-the-farm housing. On August 31,1961, there were 442 persons over 16 years registered as living in the Palisade camp, or 9.1 per cent of the workers reported by the employment department as being employed in peaches and 7.9 per cent of the total workers reported in the area on that day.

Other Housing. Since the closing of the Palisade camp, all housing is located on or near individual farms. There are no other camps or concentration of facilities under any joint operation, although some farms have housing facilities that are of camp size, with 75 to 100 workers being housed. On-the-farm facilities vary from good to very poor. In 1962, between February 6 and September 14, the employment department inspected 653 housing units in the Grand Junction area. One hundred eighty-six were found to be in good condition, 430 in fair condition, and 37 in poor condition. One farmer refused to let the department's inspector on the premises to see the housing.

Facilities for housing workers include regular farm houses, sheds, garages, barn lofts, and tents. Provisions for feeding workers also vary widely. Some workers must cook for themselves, while many of the large contract crews have access to furnished dining halls and paid cooks.

Housing for fruit workers other than peach pickers was usually available at the Palisade camp prior to its closing. However, much of the pre-harvest work in fruit is performed by locals. Housing for the workers not in fruit, sugar beets, and tomatoes, is on-the-farm. The Mexican nationals used for sugar beet and tomato work are usually housed at the Holly Sugar Company's units in Grand Junction.

Sanitation

The Mesa County Health Department had not made any sanitation inspections at the Palisade camp during the 1961 season. The director of the county health department said that some inspections had been made in prior years, but that the department's recommendations for health and sanitary measures had been ignored by the Peach Board of Control. The health department reported that they made no inspections of on-the-farm housing.

The county health department reported that it tries to have all waste peaches placed in sanitary ditches and promptly covered with dirt in order to minimize the fly problem. The department's efforts seem to have been somewhat less than effective. Field study observations, documented by photographs, showed large amounts of peaches dumped on the ground, instead of sanitary ditches, with no dirt covering them.

Health Program and Needs

During 1960 and 1961, free night medical clinics were conducted at the office of Dr. C.H. Bliss in Palisade. Prior to 1960, the clinics had been held at the Palisade camp, but this arrangement was not too satisfactory from a medical standpoint, because of the lack of supplies and equipment. In 1961, the Peach Board of Control, after considerable disagreement, finally sponsored these free night clinics and paid $500 for their operation. The Mesa County Migrant Council strongly supported the program and urged the peach board to sponsor it. Prior to 1961, and again in 1962, the clinics were either sponsored by the Mesa County Migrant Council, and/or operated gratis by Dr. Bliss. Six clinics were held in 1960 and 61 patients were seen in the clinics.

Following is a report on night clinic operations in 1961:[2]

Night Clinic Statistics

Number of people seen for medical calls	92
Number of calls	115
Number of people seen for injuries covered by compensation	8
Number of Calls	16

Types of Conditions Treated	
Muscle-skeletal	7
Psychological	3
Neurological	5
Injury (non-occupational)	5
Alcoholism	4

---

[2] Mesa County Migrant Council 1961 Report, unpaged.

Night Clinic Statistics
(continued)

Cost of night clinics $773.00
Including care, drugs, dressings, laboratory, and X-ray, etc., for medical patients.
This does not include patients covered by compensation.
This does not include cost for patients seen during the day even though they were subsequently seen in night clinics.

Age Groups:

0-15 years	17
15-20 years	13
20-30 years	11
30-40 years	15
40-50 years	16
50-60 years	6
60-70 years	7

Sex:

Male	69
Female	22

Systemic	
Measles	1
Influenza	1
Nephritis	1
Diffuse Cellulitis	2
Cervical Lymphadenitis	1
Acute appendicitis-surgery	1
Insect bite(infected)	2
Eye, ear, nose, throat	10
Chest	5
Pre natal	2
Skin infections	16
Upper respiratory	2
Genito-urinary	5
Gastro-intestinal	15
Hernia	2
Malnutrition	1
Starvation	1

The night clinics constituted only one part of the 1961 Medical Care Program. Statistics on the total program were reported by the Mesa County Migrant Council as follows:[3]

Medicare Statistics

Total patients seen	202
Total office visits	319
Children 0-6 years	34
Children 7-14 years	4
Maternity cases	8
Obstetrical - delivered	1
Total hospitalized at St. Marys	5
Veterans hospital	2
Major surgery	1
Minor surgery	21
Injuries (not related to work)	13
Office laboratory:	
Urinalysis	16
Wbc	3
Hb	7
X-ray	3
Serology	4
Urethral smear	4

Premarital exam	2
Immunizations:	
Polio	13
DPT	8
DT	0
Tetanus Toxoid	1
Smallpox	6
Special Treatment (large amount) Topical medication and extensive heavy dressings	14
Death	0
Total value of medical care & drugs	$2067.71
Drug value at retail prices	$ 436.46
Reimbursement @ $25.00 each of 10 NCL	$ 250.00
Reimbursement for Overhead and expenses $10.00 each clinic	$ 100.00

---

3. Ibid.

In presenting this statistical report, the Mesa County Migrant Council made the following comments:[4]

> Dr. L.D. Kareus reports that he gave care and medicine to 23 seasonal workers. Drs. Paul Wubben and Fred E. Brown saw a total of three patients, and both refused any compensation.
>
> Dr. Bliss reports that the privilege of medical service was not abused by either the worker or the grower, and that those who came to his office had a valid need for care. Most people were able to return to work after one office call. Had the medical care and drugs been paid for at the usual rates, they would have amounted to $2,067.71.
>
> The $500.00 received from the Control Board were spent as follows:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Dr. C.H. Bliss . . . . . | $350.00 |
> | Printing of script . . . | 17.90 |
> | Stamped envelopes. . . . | 34.96 |
> | Letterhead, stencils . . | 5.14 |
> | Dr. L.D. Kareus . . . . | 92.00 |
> | Total | $500.00 |
>
> As a result of the medical care program, the peach industry of Mesa County is receiving commendation from several national organizations. The splendid cooperation of growers, doctors, drug companies, Health and Welfare solved one of the most serious problems occurring where many seasonal workers are used.

Workers who desired to visit the clinic in Palisade were referred there by the grower, who furnished the worker with script supplied by the Peach Board of Control. This use of script allowed more accurate records to be kept of the use of the free clinics, and prevented misuse of the service by workers who were not working in peaches.

In addition to the clinics held by Dr. Bliss in Palisade, a nurse was on duty at the labor camp on a part-time basis. She took care of minor medical problems and referred the more serious ones to Dr. Bliss and other physicians. Part of the medical program offered at the labor camp included immunizations for diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, and polio.

In 1960, a public health nurse was available in Mesa County to visit migrant workers on the job and at on-the-farm housing. Despite over-all satisfaction with the migrant nurse program, the program was discontinued in 1961.

---

[4] Ibid.

According to newspaper reports, the Peach Board of Control did not support the medical care program in 1962, and Dr. Bliss again operated the clinic at his own expense.

The 1961 field study showed that 29 interviewees out of the 312 had been sick or injured since coming to the Western Slope. Twenty-two of them said that they did see a doctor about their condition, and 17 of the 22 did not pay for this doctor's care, which indicates that the workers were taking advantage of the free medical services being offered.

Staff interviews with workers showed that while the free medical care provided for peach workers was utilized, the fact that the program existed had no effect at all on influencing them to come to Colorado, and would have no effect on whether they returned to Colorado or not.

Education and Welfare

Migrant School

Palisade. The migrant summer school at Palisade has been in operation annually from 1956 through 1962. Responses to committee questions at the August 18,1961 regional meeting in Palisade revealed that most of the children enrolled in 1961 were living in the camp. The initial enrollment for the 1961 session was 28 pupils and three teachers were employed. Enrollment reached 55 during the height of peach harvest. The field survey could not be relied on to furnish any information about attendance at the migrant school, since only two children were reported in migrant school from the 124 family units interviewed on the Western Slope. In 1962, the summer school had a maximum of 52 children enrolled.

The principal of the Palisade summer school stated that the school program included all subjects ordinarily taught in the elementary grades, and the school tried to teach kindergarten through the sixth grade with an attempt being made to fit the teaching program to the students' abilities.

Absences at the summer school were largely attributable to parents moving from the labor camp to one of the orchards without letting the school know where they were to be. The principal reported, however, that he felt attendance was extremely good, considering the circumstances.

Hot lunches were served each day, with milk and rolls or cookies served during mornings and afternoons. Since many of the children had not had breakfast, milk and rolls were served within 10-15 minutes after morning arrival. Afternoon refreshments were served immediately before leaving on the bus at 2:30.

Regular School Attendance. Attendance at a regular school was reported by the 124 families interviewed for 88.9 per cent of their children between the ages of six and 16 years. Eighty-five point three per cent of the Anglo children had attended a regular school the previous year, 86.6 per cent of the Negro children, 92.0 per cent of the Spanish-

American children and all of the Indian children. One factor which became apparent from the field survey was that many of the migrant families did not start their children to school until the children were seven or eight, and allowed them to drop out as soon as they reached 16.

Attitude Toward Education. The attitudes of migrants toward education are indicated by the figures shown in Table 45. This table shows the years of schooling completed by the 124 family interviewees and the number of years they wanted their children to go to school.

TABLE 45

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Western Slope, 1961

Migrant's Years at School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend									
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	12+	NA	Total
0							2	1	3	6
1							1		1	2
2			1				3	1	2	7
3							2	3	4	9
4		1					4		3	8
5			1				3		2	6
6	1		1				4	1	2	9
7			1				5	3	6	15
8						1	7	1	7	16
9							1	3	5	9
10					1		7	2	5	15
11							1	2	4	7
12				1			3	1	4	9
12+								3		3
NA									3	3
Total	1	1	4	1	1	1	43	21	51	124

A high portion (41 per cent) of the families interviewed indicated that they had set no definite goals for their children's education. On the other hand, almost 17 per cent indicated that they would like to see their children have at least some college education and almost 35 per cent wanted their children to finish high school.

Day Care

During the 1961 peach harvest, the migrant ministry maintained a day care center at the Palisade Camp.

The child care center operated from August 23 to Sept. 6, with three supervisors. They were assisted by volunteers.

The center was held in the camp's community building because of its accessibility to the mothers. The enrollment was from 11 to 36 children each day with an average of 22. For the first time, the center accepted infants under two years. Although there was more work involved in this decision to take crib babies, the staff felt it was worth while because a survey showed that 28 mothers were able to work by having free child care available.

Lunch for the children was prepared by the supervisors and milk and graham crackers were provided for morning and afternoon snacks.

Both the playground and the large room in the community center were used for games.

Vocational Training Program

In 1961, adult education classes at the Palisade camp were held three nights a week, with three-hour sessions. The program, which lasted about eight weeks, was financed by a grant given the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches. This grant paid the salaries of the instructors ($25 per week per instructor) and provided funds for the acquistion of tools and supplies. The classes included: home economics, woodworking, and auto mechanics.

Welfare

The Mesa County Department of Welfare made the following report to the Mesa County Migrant Council concerning welfare assistance provided migrants in 1961.[5]

Financial and Statistical Report
Migrant Cases
1961 Season

Number of Applications and Inquiries Received	23
Family Cases	14
Adults	28
Children	49
Single Person Cases	9
By Type of Assistance Requested	
Total Cases	23
Food and Shelter	14
Medical Care	9
Transportation	0
By Type of Action by Department	
Total Cases	23
Approved for Assistance	17
Referred to other Agencies	1
Given Service by Department	2
Denied	3

---

[5] *Ibid*.

Expenditures

Total Expenditures		$ 2,772.80
By Type of Assistance Granted		
Food and Shelter	$ 360.40	
Medical Care	$ 57.64	
Hospitalization	$2,254.76	
Transportation	$ 100.00	

There were 23 migrant cases making application for assistance during the 1961 season. The 23 cases making application compare with 25 cases applying in each of the years 1959 and 1960. It is noted that there is a marked increase in total expenditures over the preceding two years. Expenditures for 1961 totalled $2,772.80, as compared to an expenditure of $637.21 in 1959; and $351.26 in 1960. The reason for the big increase is because of the necessity of hospitalizing nine persons during the 1961 season. Cost for hospitalization in three of these cases alone totalled $1790.04.

The Migrant

Number Interviewed

A total of 312 interviews were conducted during the field survey on the Western Slope. Because of the tremendous impact on labor needs and because of time allowed for the study, all of the interviews were with workers who had come for the peach harvest. One hundred and twenty-four interviews were with family group members and 188 with single workers. Table 46 and 47 show the number of people and workers included in the survey respectively.

TABLE 46

Number of People Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	345	85	111	541
Per Cent	63.8	15.7	20.5	100

TABLE 47

Number of Workers Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	341	56	25	422
Per Cent	80.8	13.3	5.9	100

The 124 families units interviewed reported a total of 481 children. The average number of children per family was 3.88, and the median number of children per family was 2.23.

Years a Migrant Worker

Table 48 shows the number of years the interviewee had worked as a seasonal farm worker.

TABLE 48

Years As A Migrant Worker by Age, Western Slope Interviews, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	AGE OF WORKER Under 20		21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61+		Total
	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	
0	1	17	8	7	4	2	6	6	3	1	5	2	62
1	2	20	6	3	4	4	3	3		1	1		47
2		12	1	6	3	1	1	1	2	5			32
3		9	3	2	3	1	2	1	2			1	24
4		7	1	2	2		2	1	1	1	1		18
5		4		5	1	2		2				1	15
6		6				1	1	1		1	2		12
7	1	3	1		3	1	2	1					12
8				2	3		2		1	1			9
9		1				1	2		1				5
10			2	2	2	2	3	4		2	1	2	20
11-15			2	1	1	2		3		4		1	14
16-20					1	4				1	1	1	8
21-25					2	1	1		1		1		6
26-30							3		2				5
31+							4	2	8	2	3	2	21
NA		1			1								2
TOTAL	4	80	24	30	30	22	32	25	21	19	13	12	312

The average age of all the interviewees was 35.2 years and the median age was 25.28 years.

Table 49 shows the number of years the migrants interviwed had been seasonal farm workers, as well as the number of years they had worked in Colorado.

Table 49 shows that 39.1 per cent of all the interviewees were working in Colorado for the first time and that more than 52 per cent indicated that Colorado was the only state that they had ever worked in as a seasonal farm worker other than their state of residence.

TABLE 49

Years As A Migrant Worker And Years Worked In Colorado, Western Slope Interviewees, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	Years As A Migrant In Colorado 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31+	NA	Total
0	62																	62
1	10	37																47
2	5	8	19															32
3	5	4	2	13														24
4	4	1	3	2	8													18
5	3	2	2		4	4												15
6	2	3	1	2	1		3											12
7	3	1	2	2		1		3										12
8	2	2	1		1			1	2									9
9		2				1				2								5
10	8	2	1	3	1		1				4							20
11-15	5	3	1		1					1	2	1						14
16-20	2	1	1			3							1					8
21-25	1					1		1		2				1				6
26-30	2	2													1			5
31+	6	3	2		1	3	1			1	1				1	2		21
NA	2																	2
Total	122	71	35	22	17	13	5	5	2	6	7	1	1	1	2	2		312

Home State

The home states of the 312 interviewees are shown in Table 50.

TABLE 50

Home States Of Migrant Workers, Western Slope Interviews, 1961

	Ethnic Group				
Home State	Anglo	Negro	Spanish-American	Indian	Total
Alabama		1			1
Arkansas	3	68			71
Arizona	6	5	4	6	21
California	8	2			10
Colorado	17	2	29		48
Florida	1				1
Georgia	1				1
Illinois	1				1
Indiana		1			1
Kansas	7				7
Louisiana	1	24			25
Michigan	1	1			2
Mississippi		1			1
Missouri	6	1			7
Nebraska	1			1	2
New Mexico	1		11		12
New York		1			1
North Dakota				1	1
Ohio	1				1
Oklahoma	29	6	2	14	51
Oregon	2				2
South Dakota	1			2	3
Texas	13	11	11		35
Utah	1				1
West Virginia	1				1
Wisconsin	1	1			2
Wyoming			1		1
No Home State	1				1
Canada	1				1
Total	105	125	58	24	312

Length of Time in Colorado

Table 51 shows very clearly that the majority of workers came to Colorado only for the peach harvest and did not intend to stay for any other work.

TABLE 51

Length Of Stay In Colorado By Time of Arrival, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Month Of Arrival On Western Slope	Length of Stay in Colorado							
	Less Than 1 Mo.	1-2 Mo.	2-3 Mo.	3-4 Mo.	4-5 Mo.	5-6 Mo.	More Than 6 Mo.	No Date Given
March							1	
April							1	
May				1		1		
June			1	1	2			
July		4	6	2	2			
August	239	25	1	1				14
No Date Given								10
Total	239	29	8	5	4	1	2	24

Reasons for Working in Colorado

Table 52 shows the reasons the 312 interviewees gave for preferring to work in Colorado or not preferring to work in Colorado.

TABLE 52

Reasons For Working In Colorado, Western Slope Interviews, 1961

Reasons Given	Prefer Working In Colorado	Do Not Prefer Working In Colorado
Wages	110	35
Housing	10	15
Type of Crops	32	19
Length of Season	4	2
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	11	1
Community Attitudes	22	2
Weather	76	3
Other	32	13
Only Work Offer	8	4

Wages and weather were the most commonly given reasons for preferring to work in Colorado, while wages were also the main reason for not liking the work in Colorado.

Return to Colorado Next Year

Table 53 on the following page shows the answers to the question as to whether or not the worker would return to Colorado next year and why.

TABLE 53

Return To Colorado Next Year, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Reason Given	Yes	No
Wages	91	32
Housing	17	12
Types of Crop	37	31
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	28	2
Community Attitude	15	
Other	30	25

Wages were cited as a main reason both by those workers who indicated they would return the following year and by those workers who would not return.

Reasons for Working at Seasonal Farm Labor

Table 54 lists the responses by the 312 interviewees as to why they were seasonal farm workers.

TABLE 54

Reason For Doing Seasonal Farm Work, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Reason Given	Number
No Other Job Skills	43
Able to Make More Money	70
Unemployed Otherwise	202
Enjoy it	20
Other	66

Winter Employment

Table 55 is a compilation of the type of jobs worked at during the preceding winter and the number of interviewees who worked at each type of job.

TABLE 55

Winter Employment of Migrants, Western Slope Interviews, 1961

Type of Job	Number
Farm	87
Factory	12
Housework for Wages	6
Odd Jobs	43
No Work	72
Other	108

To complete the winter employment picture, Table 56 shows the weeks worked during the winter and the amount of money earned during the winter of 1960-61.

TABLE 56

Weeks Worked During Winter and Amount Earned 1960-1961, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

	Weeks Worked	Amount Earned
Mean	10.1	$ 524.83
Median	10.0	280.00
Low	0	0
High	22	$4200.00

The Migrant And The Community

Community Attitude

Mesa County Migrant Council. Mesa County is the one area in the state where community interest in the migrant worker is well developed, organized, and has contributed concrete results to improving living and working conditions for the migrant. A brief history of the Mesa County Migrant Council, taken from the 1960 Report of the Mesa County Migrant Council, is included below:

> Until 1948, there was no organized effort to better the lot of the many migrant workers who help grow and harvest the crops of Mesa County. In June of that year, the State Director of the Migrant Ministry of the Council of Churches came in person to pioneer a work in the newly purchased Labor Camp of the Palisade peach growers.
>
> In order to support her efforts, Palisade women from several churches organized themselves into a group known as United Churchwomen. They supplied toys, clothing, milk, volunteer service, and some money. Realizing that their efforts were inadequate in comparison to the need, they began asking the help of other organizations and agencies.
>
> In this way the program was substantially broadened year by year. At their request, the Red Cross gave free swimming lessons to the children; the Recreation Commission supplied used sports equipment, the County Library gave

> books, the FFA began a long-range tree-planting project in the Camp and the Girl Scouts conducted a Pilot project. In 1955, the United Churchwomen were instrumental in bringing to Palisade a Health Project, financed by federal funds, which provided nursing and clinic service to Mesa County migrants.
>
> The same year, the Palisade Women's Club added their strength to the existing program. They established and successfully operated the first Thrift Shop, Free Child Care Center, and Sewing Center. The need for a coordinating group was most evident, so that fall they invited all organizations which had contributed to the Child Care Center to send a representative to form a County Migrant Council. Thirty-five organizations and eight interested people joined with the professional agencies - Health, Welfare, and Migrant Ministry - in answer to this appeal.
>
> So was born the Mesa County Migrant Council which coordinates activities in behalf of migrant workers; supplies information to the public, to growers, and to the migrants themselves; carries on projects, such as the Child Care Center; and develops other services as needed. As a Council, we have been able to secure a Special Summer School for migrant children, extend the original services of the Public Health Department, and continue to increase the effectiveness of existing services.

The 1961 report of the Mesa County Migrant Council lists a total voting membership of 63 individuals and organizations, including governmental agencies such as the departments of health, education, welfare, and employment and Mesa County School District No. 51; several church and service organizations; and the Council of Churches' Migrant Ministry Program.

Peach Board of Control. While several Peach Board of Control members, and many growers, are members of the Migrant Council, the two organizations have not always seemed to pursue the same goals. The council is worker oriented and vigorously pushes programs designed from a humanitarian viewpoint first with economic benefits to the grower second. The board, of course, is oriented toward the grower's economic position and, therefore, has been less inclined to support social programs for migrant workers. The board did underwrite the 1961 migrant medical care program, however, as indicated in a previous section.

Law Enforcement Problem

Law officers on the Western Slope report few problems in the transportation of workers, since all trucks traveling interstate must comply with ICC regulations concerning safety requirements, rest stops, load limits for trucks, etc.

Some local police problems do arise during the peach harvest season, but the police officers are aware of this and take steps to correct them before any trouble or injuries occur. Drinking on the streets or in the parks is closely watched and quickly stopped when found. Loitering in parks after dark is not permitted. None of the peace officers contacted on the Western Slope felt that the migrants caused enough special problems to need any corrective state legislation.

Crop Activities and Acreage

The San Juan Basin, which includes Montezuma and Dolores counties, is predominantly a dry land farming region with some irrigated acreage. The principal crops grown are dry pinto beans, fruits, and hay.

Crops Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor

The principal crop for which seasonal farm labor is used in the San Juan Basin is pinto beans. Other crops requiring lesser amounts of seasonal farm labor include: hay, small fruits (cherries and apricots), and apples. Table 57 shows the number of farms growing fruit in 1959 and the number of bushels harvested in Montezuma County in 1959 (latest figures available).

TABLE 57

1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Montezuma County[a]

Fruit	No. of Farms	Quantity Harvested
Apricots	66	529 bushels
Apples	133	77,521 bushels
Sour Cherries	49	2,221 pounds
Sweet Cherries	36	1,156 pounds
Peaches	96	16,649 bushels
Pears	55	759 bushels
Plums	52	215 bushels

---

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final, 1960 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April, 1961.

Table 58 on the following page shows the pinto bean acreage and harvest in Dolores and Montezuma counties in 1960.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production. During the 10-year period, 1950-1960, total harvested acreage of dry beans in Dolores County increased slightly, from 35,650 acres to 36,250 acres, or 1.7 per cent. During the same period in Montezuma County, the increase in harvested acres was almost nine per cent (from 48,900 acres to 53,300 acres). The increase in dry bean acreage for the area as a whole was 5.9 per cent.

TABLE 58

Bean Acreage and Harvest in the San Juan Basin in 1960[a]

	Montezuma County	Dolores County	Total
Irrigated Land			
Acres Harvested	350	---	350
Pounds Per Acre	1,100	---	1,100
Production 100 lb. Bags	3,850	---	3,850
Non-irrigated Land			
Acres Harvested	52,950	36,250	89,200
Pounds Per Acre	280	280	280
Production 100 lb. Bags	148,085	101,500	249,585
Total			
Acres Harvested	53,300	36,250	89,550
Production 100 lb. Bags	151,935	101,500	253,435
Value	$1,063,545	$710,500	$1,774,045

---

a. *Colorado Agricultural Statistics*, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April, 1962.

Table 59 shows the total number of farms in Dolores and Montezuma counties for 1950 and 1960, the median size farm, and the per cent of increase of the median size farm.

TABLE 59

Number of Farms and Median Size San Juan Basin, 1950 and 1960[a]

	Number of Farms		Per Cent of	Median Size (Acres)		Per Cent of
County	1950	1960	Change	1950	1960	Change
Dolores	246	184	-25.2%	339	531	+56.6%
Montezuma	978	744	-23.9	162	253	+56.2
Total	1,224	928	-24.2%	501	784	+56.5%

---

a. Federal Census data.

This table shows that the San Juan Basin reflects the changing agricultural pattern of the state as a whole. The number of farms decreased almost one-fourth, and the average farm size increased more than one-half.

Mechanization and Technological Change

Several different opinions have been expressed concerning the extent of bean harvest mechanization in the San Juan Basin. The manager of the employment department's Cortez area office stated that mechanization had progressed very rapidly in recent years and that a major portion of the crop is harvested mechanically. He modified this statement by the observation that growers are more likely to use hand labor if the crop is a good one. It was the opinion of the Montezuma county agent that only 20 per cent of the bean harvest in Montezuma County was not mechanized. In Dolores County, the county agent said that only 10 to 20 per cent of the harvest was not mechanized.

Interviews with several growers indicated that there appears to be no valid reason why the pinto bean harvest cannot be completely mechanized. One grower, for example, strongly expressed his opinion that the use of hand labor was not only more costly to the grower but also resulted in a poorer quality bean. (The use of hand shocking resulted in more dirt in the threshed beans.) Other farmers stated that they preferred hand labor because the workers picked up enough scattered beans to more than offset the added cost of hand shocking. The impression was conveyed by several growers that the use of hand labor in the pinto bean harvest is mostly a tradition and that complete mechanization will be effected in a few years.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

Most, if not all, of the seasonal workers available are Navajo Indians from New Mexico and Arizona. For many years, the Navajos have come to the San Juan Basin in search of work, but they do not think of themselves as migratory workers. Rather, they consider their stay in the area as an opportunity to earn a few dollars for food, clothing, and other necessities before winter.

One of the major problems facing both the grower and the worker is the difficulty of communication. Few, if any, growers can speak the Navajo language. Most Navajos can speak some English, but many of them do not speak it well and prefer their native language. During the field interviews, even those who could speak good English preferred to remain silent while their designated spokesman answered questions through an interpreter. This lack of ability to communicate may lead to misunderstanding and distrust on the part of both the grower and the worker. The grower does not expect to learn to speak a language such as Navajo, and the older Navajos either can't or won't learn to speak English.

Many growers have complained about the unreliability of the Navajo workers, pointing out that the workers often leave the area during the middle of the harvest, causing the grower added expense in the recruitment and employment of another crew. Liquor consumption was cited by several growers as a chief cause of the Navajo's unreliability. They reported that after a weekend the Navajo already employed would either fail to show up or refuse to work until the middle of the following week.

The attitudes of the growers toward the Navajo are similar to those of the community in general. These attitudes toward the Navajo workers vary greatly. Some growers would like to help the Navajo achieve some of the material and cultural benefits of the white man's society; many are inclined to have as little to do with the Navajo as possible, except to employ them for a few weeks in the bean harvest. Generally, the growers accept the existing attitude without giving it much thought.

Navajo workers have been coming to find work in the basin for a great number of years, and the feeling is that they will continue to do so. The Navajo are considered no particular problem as long as their work is acceptable. If a worker becomes a problem, he can be returned to the reservation and another employed in his place.

Only one grower appeared before the Migrant Labor Committee at the Cortez regional meeting; consequently, it is apparent that the growers feel they do not have any major problems with their seasonal farm labor.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers--Peak Employment

The seasonal farm labor peak is reached in September during pinto bean harvest. In 1961, the following totals were reported for September by the employment department's Cortez area office:

Week	Total Workers	Workers in Pinto Beans	Per Cent of Total Workers in Pinto Beans
1st	1,400	700	50.0%
2nd	2,400	1,500	62.5
3rd	800	500	62.5
4th	2,300	1,500	65.2

Pinto bean harvest, as shown above, requires most of the seasonal farm labor force in the San Juan Basin. Other seasonal farm workers in the month of September were employed in apples, hay, and other farming activities.

More than 1,000 seasonal farm workers were employed in the San Juan Basin by the middle of May, in 1960 and 1961, according to the employment department's weekly estimates. This total increased gradually on a week-by-week basis until the end of June. Throughout July and August, the total number of workers varied considerably, with a low of 700 workers and a high of 1,650 workers.

During 1962, the early season peak of 600 workers did not occur until the first week of July, and this figure remained fairly constant until the last week of August, when the total number of workers dropped to 350. The peak employment of 900 workers in 1962 was reached during the first two weeks of October, somewhat later than usual.

Long Range Trends. There had not been much change in the annual number of farm workers in the San Juan Basin for bean harvest for several years prior to 1962. During both 1956 and 1957, the employment department reported a peak employment of 1,500 workers in dry beans. In 1960, the peak employment figure was 1,600 workers and, in 1961, 1,500 workers; however, the 1962 peak employment of workers for bean harvest was only 650. Without further information about crop conditions in the area, it appears that either there has been a vast increase in mechanization in the past year or that the employment department has instituted a new system of counting workers.

Employment Department Statistics. During the 1961 field study in the San Juan Basin, every bean-producing section was covered by the field staff. These on-the-spot observations resulted in an estimate of approximately 500 seasonal workers employed during bean harvest, or one-third of the total reported by the employment department. In this connection, it should be noted (as mentioned above) that employment department estimates of workers for 1962 are almost 57 per cent less than in 1961. In June and July, 1961, employment department statistics indicated that as many as 250 to 300 workers were employed for apples and small fruit. A field check was made of the area in which many of these workers were supposed to have been employed, and very few orchards were found; in none of them were there any seasonal workers.

Use of Local Workers. The employment department's estimates of employment of locals in seasonal farm labor remained fairly constant for the three years of 1960, 1961, and 1962. In 1960, a peak of 600 locals were employed during the last three weeks of June and the first week of July. In 1961, a peak of 800 locals were employed in the second week of October, and, in 1962, the peak employment of locals occurred during the second week of August and again during the third week of September when 550 locals were working.

Recruitment

The employment department does not attempt extensive recruitment, not even during bean harvest, according to the employment department manager in Cortez. Apparently, extensive recruitment is not necessary, as most growers prefer Navajo workers and they may recruit them directly from the reservation at Shiprock or through a trading post. Many Navajos come to the San Juan Basin and find their own employment.

The employment department acts mostly as a referring agency for those Navajos who contact the department's office in Cortez or the mobile office in Dove Creek.

Forty-one Navajo workers were interviewed during the 1961 field study. Only three stated that they had obtained their present jobs through the employment department. Two reported that they had returned to their previous employer on their own; one had obtained a job through arrangements made by the employer; 33 had found jobs just by asking around; one had found a job by other means; and one did not answer the question.

Number and Source. No intrastate or interstate workers were found, other than Navajo Indians, even though the employment department reported that there were from 300 to 500 intrastate workers in the Cortez area in September, 1960; from 250 to 400 intrastate workers in September, 1961; and from 50 to 150 intrastate workers in September, 1962. No Spanish-American or Anglo migrant workers were found in the area, and no Mexican nationals are recruited.

Labor Market Organization

The labor market in the San Juan Basin is largely unorganized. It would be very difficult to change the present employment pattern or to recruit Navajos for work in another area. The Navajos come to the basin to work because they or their families have done so for years and it is not too far from the reservation. They have no desire, however, to work elsewhere in Colorado. Twenty-five of the 41 Navajos interviewed stated that they had not worked for wages before they came to the San Juan Basin in 1961, and twenty-six stated that they would not work for wages after they left the San Juan Basin.

This attitude of the Navajos toward working elsewhere probably explains the lack of effort by the employment department to try to refer the Navajo workers to other areas of Colorado once they are in the San Juan Basin. There is work available in the San Luis Valley after the pinto bean harvest is completed in the basin, and several hundred Navajos are recruited from the reservations in New Mexico and Arizona and transported to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest. As far as could be determined, hardly any of the Navajo bean harvest workers go to the San Luis Valley to pick potatoes.

Few growers call on the employment department when they need labor. Some growers prefer to make their own arrangements to obtain workers with the Navajo Tribal Council. While this practice provides workers in sufficient quantity, the employment department is bypassed, and its potential control over allocation or reallocation of the available labor supply is reduced.

Wage Rates and Earnings

The prevailing wage rate for work in pinto beans for both 1961 and 1962 was $.75 to $1.00 per hour, as reported by the employment department. Other wage rates reported were $1.00 to $1.25 per hour for work in hay in 1961, and $1.00 per hour for hay work in 1962. There is very little seasonal farm work paid by piece rate in the San Juan Basin.

The field survey in 1961 showed the following rates being paid:

Rate	Number of Interviewees[a]
$ .75 Hour	32
.80 Hour	3
1.00 Hour	3
180.00 Month	1
	39

---

[a] Two did not know method or amount of payment.

Each Navajo interviewed was asked how much he and/or his family had earned during the past week. These answers were tabulated and are shown in Table 60.

TABLE 60

Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants
in the San Juan Basin, 1961

	Family	Single
Mean	$26.08	$17.25
Median	24.00	12.00
Low Earnings	00.00	00.00
High Earnings	80.75	45.00

Each worker interviewed was also asked how much he had earned from April 1, 1961 until the time of the interview. The average weekly earnings during this period for family groups and single workers are shown in Table 61.

TABLE 61

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time
of Interview, San Juan Basin, 1961

	Family	Single
Mean	$13.99	$27.72
Median	9.72	19.57
Low Average	00.00	8.70
High Average	41.25	63.04

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

Housing facilities for the migrant workers in the San Juan Basin were the worst found anywhere in the state. Of the 41 persons interviewed during the field study, only 17 were living in any kind of frame structure, not necessarily a house. Garages, sheds, and old buses were used, as were old, abandoned houses. Some Navajos lived in tents or had no shelter at all and slept in the sagebrush.

Several growers and other residents of the area stated that one of the reasons that housing was not provided was the Navajos' fear of sleeping in a house in which some person may have died. The Navajo interpreter assisting in the field study confirmed that there was such a belief among the Navajo, but only the very old and very ignorant held it anymore. All of the workers who were not sleeping in a house were asked if they would prefer a house to their present shelter. Without exception, they answered in the affirmative.

There is little permanent housing available in the basin for seasonal farm labor, and few farmers can see any need to build new facilities that might be used only one month a year. The lack of housing might work adversely, because poor living conditions could make recruitment and retention of workers more difficult.

The use of cooking stoves was a rarity among the Navajo workers. Whether cooking stoves were not furnished or whether the Navajo preferred not to use them could not be determined. In any case, the usual method of cooking food was over an open campfire.

Rudimentary sanitary facilities were lacking, except where the workers' quarters were located near enough to the farm residence to have access to a privy. No attempt was made to provide privies or garbage or waste cans for those workers living some distance from a farmhouse.

Water was hauled or carried from the nearest available source, usually the farm well or cistern. In one instance, the farmer had supplied his workers with a large tank truck of water for their needs.

Between May and July, 1962, the employment department inspected all of the housing units in the San Juan Basin that could be used for housing seasonal farm workers. Twenty-nine units were inspected. Six of the units were rated in good condition by the employment department, and 23 were rated as fair. None was found to be in poor condition or in an unacceptable condition.

Health Needs

It is extremely difficult to get a clear picture of the health needs of the seasonal workers in the San Juan Basin. Their nearness to the Navajo reservation made health services available to them, but evidently not all of the Navajos can or do take advantage of these free services.

Eight persons interviewed said that they had been sick since coming to Colorado (the most common ailment was a cold); but only three of them had gone to a doctor; the other five did nothing. Four persons interviewed said that they had been injured since coming to Colorado (minor wire cuts, no serious injuries), but only one considered his injury serious enough to seek medical assistance. Two persons reported that they had (either now or previously) tuberculosis.

A survey of health needs of the migrant Navajo worker was conducted in the San Juan Basin in 1959 by Lela Mallett of the San Juan Basin Health Unit. Miss Mallett did not interview any workers but confined her survey to growers, the employment department, community leaders, and doctors and other health officials. Her comments regarding medical care for the Navajo worker are as follows:[1]

---

[1] Narrative Report of Lela Mallett on Migrant Worker Survey Done in the San Juan Basin of Colorado, May 15-October 15,1959,pp. 3-5.

So many answers were given in answering the question relative to medical care. One answer was that the ill person was taken to the physician of his choice and all fees were paid by the Tribe. One person giving this answer had employed Navajos for 30 years. To clarify the policies regarding medical payments by the Tribe, the Director of the San Juan Basin Health Unit felt a conference with Dr. William C. Larsen, Medical Officer in Charge at the Shiprock Hospital, Shiprock, New Mexico, would be worthwhile. Dr. Larsen was very cordial and cooperative in answering all questions asked. The first question asked of him was, What is the policy regarding ill Navajos off the Reservation? His answer was that they welcome them at any of the Indian Hospitals at Shiprock, Fort Defiance, Crown Point, Winslow, or Tuba City, or at any of the Out-Patient Clinics at Towaoc, Dulce, Ignacio or Kayenta. The non-resident, that is, the Navajo who has a permanent job and home elsewhere, must provide his own transportation to the facility. If they live on the Reservation, they are eligible for all care. Only in dire emergency will the U.S. Public Health Service pay for any care given off the Reservation and this emergency care must be authorized by the Doctor on Call at the Shiprock Hospital before it is given, otherwise there will be no payment from Health Service funds. This policy is necessary because of shortage of these funds.

While in Shiprock, we also had a conference with Miss Mildred Jones, Supervisor of Public Health Nursing in the Shiprock area of the Navajo Reservation, regarding family health records kept on or given to the families in the area. The only record they give the family is the Merck, Sharp & Dohme Immunization record. The small section is given the family and the larger section is kept in the Nursing office files.

Due to the proximity of the Navajo Reservation, and Shiprock, to all areas of the Basin, no area being more than 75 miles away, most medical problems are returned to the Reservation without too much difficulty; however, a very real hardship occurs often for the unemployed who are off the Reservation in search of employment when illness or accident befalls them. As one physician said, "The off-Reservation Indian is in a No-Man's Land where neither the Tribe nor the government will claim him." The Bureau of Indian Affairs refuses reimbursement for care, the Welfare Departments are not set up to pay for care of the Migrant and it ends with "the physicians and the

hospitals being left holding the bag."
A Superintendent of Schools said, "The Navajo is not being treated fairly. He is being urged to leave the Reservation in search of work, then care is refused him if anything happens before he finds employment. It looks as if a premium is being placed on the lazy tribe member who just stays on the Reservation so that he can receive care."

If the worker, or a member of his family, becomes ill, the farmer, or more likely his wife, takes the sick person to the physician of his choice. In some instances, this has been the Tribal Medicine Man. More often, the patient is taken to the employer's physician, the Doctor is paid by the employer (this fee sometimes being deducted from pay, sometimes not) and the employer's wife helps the mother or wife in interpreting the Doctor's orders. There is a growing tendency to integrate the Indian into the community's activities and schools and the physicians treat him just as any other employed person in the community, expecting him to pay for his medical care just as anyone else is expected to do.

Education and Welfare

Education

School Attendance. The field survey in 1961 showed that there were 17 children between the ages of six and 16 with the 37 family groups that were interviewed in the San Juan Basin. Thirteen of these children attended a regular school session when they were at their home base.

The 37 family groups had left 47 children of school age behind when they came to Colorado, and 37 of these children were in school. Out of the total of 64 school age children in the interview group, 50 were either in school at the time of the interview or would enter school as soon as they returned home.

Most of the Navajo workers seem to make some effort, however limited, to get their children into school. A few told the staff that they didn't want their children to go to school and didn't send them when they had the chance. One family reported that they couldn't send their children to school because they couldn't afford clothes for them.

Need for Summer School. The attitude of the Navajos who brought their children to Colorado would seem to eliminate any need for a summer school program in the San Juan Basin. The children who are old enough to work are allowed to work, and both parents and children prefer this arrangement to school attendance.

Other factors tend to complicate any attempt to establish a summer school program. First, and perhaps of primary importance, is the fact that the workers are only in the basin for three or four weeks, and while there they may change their place of employment several times. Second, there are no large concentrations of workers, and attendance at a centrally-located school would involve many miles of driving each day. Third, the peak use of Navajo workers occurs during September when regular school is in session. Since none of the migrant children tries to enroll in the regular schools, it is doubtful that space or teachers could be made available for a special program.

Attitude Toward Education. That the Navajo has no deep feeling about having his children attend school is shown in Table 62.

TABLE 62

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Juan Basin, 1961

Migrant's Years At School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend				
	6	12	12+	No Answer	Total
0		2		21	23
1					0
2		2		3	5
3		1	1	3	5
4				2	2
5	1				1
6				1	1
Total	1	5	1	30	37

Thirty of the 37 family groups did not give definite answers as to how many years they wanted their children to attend school. The usual answers given were that the children could go as long as they wanted to or that the children would go as long as the parents could afford to send them. Only seven families seemed to have established any goals for sending their children to school.

The Montezuma county school superintendent reported that no attempt is made to enroll the Navajo children during regular school sessions for several reasons: 1) Navajo children are in the area for only a short time; 2) many of the Navajo children have not attained the grade level commensurate with their ages and could cause some adjustment problems; and 3) school attendance is a responsibility of the local districts and not of county officials.

Welfare

The local welfare units in the San Juan Basin reported to the staff that no assistance was granted to seasonal farm workers in their areas.

No workers were interviewed who had requested or received welfare assistance in Colorado; but five interviewees said they had received some welfare assistance the preceding winter; three had drawn unemployment compensation; and two received old age pension allowances from their home states.

The Migrant

Number Interviewed

A total of 41 interviews were conducted by the staff during the field survey in the San Juan Basin in 1961. Thirty-seven of the interviews covered family groups, and four interviews were with single workers. Tables 63 and 64 show the number of people included in the survey and the number of workers included in the survey.

TABLE 63

Number of People Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	45	30	33	108
Per Cent	41.7	27.8	30.5	100

TABLE 64

Number of Workers Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	36	22	4	62
Per Cent	58.1	35.5	6.4	100

The 37 family units had a total of 177 children of all ages. The median number of children per family was five.

Years as a Migrant Worker

Table 65 shows the number of years the interviewee had worked as a seasonal farm worker.

TABLE 65

Years As A Migrant Worker By Age, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	Age of Worker												Total
	Under 20		21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61 & over		
	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	
0													0
1			1		5				1		2		9
2				2	1	1	1		3				8
3									1				1
4									1				1
5											1		1
6													0
7													0
8			1								1		2
9					1								1
10									1				1
11-15						1							1
16-20					4		1						5
21-25					1								1
26-30									1				1
31+							2		4		3		9
Total	0	0	2	2	12	2	4	0	12	0	7	0	41

None of the interviewees was under 20 years of age, and only four were under 30 years. Mean age for all of the interviewees was 46.5 years, and the median age was 51 years.

Table 66 shows the number of years the migrants interviewed had worked in Colorado, according to the total number of years worked as a migrant.

TABLE 66

Years As A Migrant Worker In Colorado
San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11-15	16-20	26-30	31+	Total
1	9													9
2		8												8
3			1											1
4				1										1
5					1									1
8		1					1							2
9								1						1
10									1					1
11-15										1				1
16-20		1	1			1					2			5
21-25		1												1
26-30										1		1		2
31+	3		1		1				1			1	1	8
Total	12	11	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	41

Home State of the Migrant

Twenty-three of the Navajos interviewed were from New Mexico; 10 were from Utah; seven were from Arizona; and one said that he now considered Colorado as his home state.

Length of Stay in Colorado

Table 67 shows the length of time the Navajo worker intended to stay in Colorado by time of arrival.

TABLE 67

Length Of Time In Colorado By Date Of Arrival, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Date of Arrival	Less Than 1 mo.	1-2 mo.	2-3 mo.	3-4 mo.	4-5 mo.	5-6 mo.	More Than 6 mo.	No Date Given	Total
April					1				1
May						1			1
August	1								1
September	29	1							30
No Date Given								8	8
Total	30	1	–	–	1	1	–	8	41

Attitudes Toward Working in Colorado

Table 68 gives an account of the reasons expressed for working as a seasonal farm worker in Colorado.

TABLE 68

Reason For Working in Colorado, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Reason Given	Prefer Working In Colorado	Do Not Prefer Working In Colorado
Wages	3	4
Housing	1	0
Types of Crops	13	0
Length of Season	0	0
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	1	1
Community Attitudes	0	0
Weather	0	1
Only Job Offer	8	1
Other	10	1
Total[a]	36	9

a. Totals do not equal 41 because of multiple reasons given.

More workers were dissatisfied with wages received than were satisfied. The most common reason given for preferring to work in Colorado was the type of crops. Several workers said that their employment at the time of the interview was the only job offer they had received. In order to give another indication of how well the workers liked working in Colorado, they were also asked if they would return to the same place next year. The results of this question are shown in Table 69.

TABLE 69

Return to Colorado Next Year, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Reasons Given	Yes	No
Wages	1	3
Housing	1	0
Types of Crops	9	0
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	3	0
Community Attitude	0	1
Other	21	0
Total[a]	35	4

a. NA responses are not included.

One reason for the high percentage of "other" answers to the questions was the difficulty in communicating with the interviewees. Most workers either did not understand the question as interpreted or responded with a noncommittal answer.

Those interviewed were also asked why they did seasonal farm labor. One-third of the interviewees said that they would otherwise be unemployed; four workers replied that they could not earn as much at any other employment; and two said they enjoyed it. The remainder gave diverse answers, such as "to buy groceries," or "to buy shoes." Apparently, seasonal farm labor was accepted as a way of life without much thought.

Winter Employment

Employment was limited and earnings low for Navajo workers in the winter of 1960-61. Table 70 lists the type of work performed, if any, by interviewees during the 1960-1961 winter.

TABLE 70

Winter Employment of San Juan Basin Migrant Workers, 1961

Type of Job	Number
Farm	15
Factory	0
Housework	1
Odd Jobs	0
No Work	20
Other	5
Total	41

Twenty out of the 41 interviewees did no work at all during the winter. Again, because of communication problems, it could not be determined whether the 15 who had worked on farms were working for wages or were working on their own farms. Table 71 shows the average number of weeks worked and amount earned by those Navajos employed during the 1960-61 winter.

TABLE 71

Weeks Worked During The Winter
And Amount Earned, San Juan Basin Migrants,1961

	Weeks Worked	Earnings
Mean	3.92	$ 173.73
Median	0	0
Low	0	0
High	22	$1,400.00

The Migrant and the Community

Community Attitudes

The mayor of Cortez reported that, so far as the community was concerned, the migrant workers caused no particular problems. The workers are accepted as a necessity for getting the bean crop harvested. The workers generally feel that they are accepted by the community on a temporary basis during the time they are in the area. Only one interviewee said that he would not like to come back to the area again because of adverse community attitudes.

Even though the Navajo is more or less accepted, there are no programs designed to assist him and no organization actively concerned with his problems.

Law Enforcement Problems

The law enforcement officials in the San Juan Basin reported no law enforcement problems caused by the migrant workers. They said that for the most part the Navajos were well behaved, and only on weekends was there any problem with intoxication. An interview with the Cortez city jailer indicated that most of the intoxicated workers who are locked up are put into jail for their own protection since they usually are more of a menace to themselves than to society.

The state patrol officer in Cortez stated that the transportation facilities for migrant workers in the San Juan Basin were improving each year. Many workers now travel in small trucks or pickups. These vehicles are checked for safety requirements at the port of entry, as well as by the patrol officers.

NORTHERN COLORADO

Crop Activities and Acreage

Sugar beets require the most labor of any single crop in Northern Colorado, with potatoes, onions, cucumbers, tomatoes, green beans, and other fresh vegetables requiring lesser amounts of seasonal labor. The hay, corn, wheat and small grain crops grown extensively in this area require labor also, but most of the workers utilized in these crops are permanent employees, except for some seasonal workers used for irrigation and tractor operation.

Crops Using Seasonal Farm Labor

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet acreage and production in Northern Colorado in 1961 is shown in Table 72. Weld County had the largest sugar beet acreage in the state. The 75,925 acres of sugar beets harvested in Weld County was about 54 per cent of the Northern Colorado total and about 45 per cent of the state total of 167,000 acres. Average per acre yield in Northern Colorado in 1961 was 14.8 tons, as compared with the state average of 14.7 tons per acre. In 1960, the average yield per acre was 18.2 tons, and the state average was 17.8 tons. The Northern Colorado counties accounted for more than 83 per cent of the total sugar beet acreage and for more than 84 per cent of total state production.

TABLE 72

Sugar Beet Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1961[a]

County	Acres Planted	Per Cent Harvested	Acres Harvested	Tons Per Acre	Production Tons
Adams	3,631	96	3,499	13.7	48,074
Boulder	3,922	98	3,850	16.4	63,061
Larimer	11,107	97	10,768	13.8	148,740
Logan	13,785	97	13,336	14.6	195,423
Morgan	26,720	96	25,708	16.0	410,304
Sedgwick	5,261	99	5,209	16.6	86,366
Washington	1,058	96	1,018	13.2	13,477
Weld	79,961	95	75,925	14.5	1,101,091
Total	145,445	95.8	139,313	14.8	2,066,536

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture in cooperation with U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Potatoes. Potato acreage and production in Northern Colorado in 1960 is shown in Table 73. Weld County had the largest number of acres planted in potatoes in 1960 in Northern Colorado and was second in the state; only Rio Grande County had a greater acreage. The 14,510 acres of potatoes harvested in 1960 in Northern Colorado was 26 per cent of the state acreage and the 3,181,200 sacks (100 pound) of potatoes grown amounted to 26.7 per cent of all the potatoes grown in the state on irrigated land.

TABLE 73

Potato Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1960[a]

County	Acres Planted	Acres Harvested	CWT. Per Acre	Production CWT.
Adams	120	110	210	23,100
Larimer	210	200	195	39,000
Logan	50	40	220	8,800
Morgan	2,290	2,220	240	532,800
Phillips	50	50	210	10,500
	790	710	230	163,300
Weld	11,490	11,180	215	2,403,700
Total	15,000	14,510	219	3,181,200

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture in cooperation with U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Other Crops. Other crops in Northern Colorado requiring varying amounts of labor are onions, cantaloupes, snap beans, cucumbers and several other vegetables grown both for processing and the fresh market. Acreage for all of these crops except cucumbers, is shown in Table 74. Cucumber acreage in 1959 in Northern Colorado was 2280[1] with the majority of the acreage in Larimer County. No production figures are available for the crops listed in Table 74. Weld and Adams counties accounted for more than 78 per cent of the acreage planted in these commercial crops in 1960. Weld County is second in the state(Otero County ranks first) in onion acreage and accounted for almost 23 per cent of the total state onion acreage. Adams County ranked fourth in the state in the number of acres planted in cantaloupe and had 13 per cent of the total state acreage in this crop. Northern Colorado ranked first in the acres planted in snap beans, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, celery, sweet corn, and tomatoes.

---

[1] Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final and 1960 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture in cooperation with U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 74

Cantaloupe, Onions, and Vegetables Acreage
Northern Colorado, 1960[a]

County	Cantaloupe	Onions	Snap Bean	Cabbage	Carrots	Cauliflower	Celery	Sweet Corn	Lettuce	Green Peas	Spinach	Tomatoes	Total Acres
Adams	370	880	130	450	450	220	100	700	80	20	140	70	3,610
Arapahoe		10	10	20		20		20	10		10		100
Boulder	20	150	40	170	20	10		140	10	10	30	80	680
Jefferson	10	20	40	20	10	30	20	350	20	10	10	10	550
Larimer	20	20	20	20	10	10		70	10	10		10	200
Logan	20	30						40				10	100
Morgan	30	170						10				40	250
Sedgwick	20	120						20					160
Weld	140	2,000	120	370	500	40	20	270	40		40	180	3,720
Total	630	3,400	360	1,050	990	330	140	1,620	170	50	230	400	9,370

---

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture in cooperation with U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet acreage for the past ten years has increased about 14 per cent for Northern Colorado as a whole, with Morgan County registering a 60 per cent increase in acres harvested between 1950 and 1960. Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Sedgwick and Weld counties also had increased acreage in sugar beets, while Adams and Washington counties both declined slightly. The average yield over the 1950-1960 period increased from 16.5 tons per acre to 18.2 tons per acre, or 10.3 per cent.

Potatoes. Potato acreage in 1950 totaled 16,720, but decreased 15 per cent to 14,510 in 1960. Total production for the period decreased from 3,938,688 100-pound sacks to 3,181,200 100-pound sacks and yield decreased from 235 sacks per acre to about 219 sacks per acre. Weld County potato acreage declined more than 1,900 acres in this ten-year period; Sedgwick County declined 740 acres; Larimer County 120 acres; and Logan County 50 acres. Adams, Morgan, and Phillips counties all reported increased potato acreage.

Other Crops. Acres planted in commercial vegetables declined substantially between 1950 and 1960. Total acreage decreased from 14,921 to 9,370, with the greatest decreases in Adams and Weld counties. Boulder County reported the only increase in commercial vegetable acreage for the ten-year period, from 372 to 680 acres. By crops, the largest decreases were in cabbage, celery, sweet corn, lettuce, green peas, and tomatoes. Snap beans and cauliflower acreage declined very little, while cantaloupe, onion, carrot, and spinach acreage increased slightly.

Cherries. Cherry production in Larimer County fell sharply between 1950 and 1960. The number of farms reporting commercial cherry trees decreased from 490 in 1950 to 84 in 1960. The number of bearing cherry trees decreased from 152,571 to 48,805 during the same period. Production in 1950 was 2,702,500 pounds, while 1960 production was only 1,274,717 pounds.

Number of Farms and Size. The decrease in number of farms in Northern Colorado between 1950 and 1960 reflects the national trend. The number of farms in the counties of Adams, Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, and Weld decreased from 12,385 in 1950 to 10,394 in 1960. All seven counties reported a decrease in the number of farms, with Adams having the largest decrease, 32.5 per cent; Boulder, 31.5 per cent; Larimer, 17.2 per cent; Weld, 10.5 per cent; Sedgwick, 7.1 per cent; Logan, 6.2 per cent; and Morgan, 4.6 per cent. The over-all decrease in number of farms was 16.1 per cent. During the same period the median size of farms in the seven counties decreased from 153 to 145 acres. The counties of Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Sedgwick and Weld all had a decrease in median farm size, while Adams and Morgan counties had an increase in median farm size. Table 75 shows the comparison between 1950 and 1960 in number of farms and medium farm size for the seven counties.

TABLE 75

Number of Farms and Median Size,
Northern Colorado, 1950 and 1960[a]

	Number of Farms			Median Farm Size		
County	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent Change	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent Change
Adams	1589	1072	- 32.5%	77.3	100	+29.3%
Boulder	1320	904	- 31.5	72.0	61.7	-14.3
Larimer	1741	1341	- 17.2	112	76.9	-31.3
Logan	1482	1390	- 6.2	427	323.8	-24.1
Morgan	1361	1298	- 4.6	187.3	194	+ 3.6
Sedgwick	474	440	- 7.1	390	331.7	-14.9
Weld	4418	3952	- 10.5	154	103	-33.1
Total	12,385	10,394	- 16.1	153	145	- 5.2

a. Based on federal census data.

Mechanization and Technological Change

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet harvest in Northern Colorado is 100 per cent mechanized. Mechanization in pre-harvest activities is proceeding rapidly since the introduction of monogerm seed several years ago. The proportion of sugar beet acreage planted in monogerm seed varies from 80 to 100 per cent among the seven counties. Some hand labor is still used for blocking and thinning operations on most farms throughout the area, but most of the blocking and thinning work is done with long handled hoes rather than short handled hoes, as in the Arkansas Valley and Western Slope. A small number of farmers have eliminated the blocking and thinning operation completely and use labor only in weeding sugar beets. The use of long handled hoes is most prevalent on acreage planted in monogerm seed.

The use of mechanical thinning machines is becoming more widespread in Northern Colorado. The manager of the Greeley district for the Great Western Sugar Company estimated that as much as 80 per cent of the beet acreage in his district had some mechanical pre-harvest work done on it in 1962. In the Brighton district of Great Western, the manager estimated that 20 per cent of the acreage was mechanically blocked and thinned in 1962 and hand labor was used only for weeding. All of the district office managers for Great Western reported that pre-harvest mechanization was proceeding much more quickly than had the previous mechanization of harvest activities. The Mountain States Beet Growers' Association has been advising its members to be ready to mechanize pre-harvest work completely by the 1964 growing season, because the association is not certain that Mexican national labor will be available after 1963.

Snap Beans. In 1962, the harvest of green snap beans in Northern Colorado was mechanized to a greater extent than in any preceding year. New and more efficient bean picking machines were introduced and used successfully. At least one major producer of snap beans reported that his harvest was 100 per cent mechanized this year for the first time.

Mechanical picking of green beans is termed successful, even though the machines do not pick as many beans per acre as hand pickers can. The cost of machine picking to the farmer is about $.0125 per pound and the cost of hand picking about $.0225 per pound. Farmers reported that they preferred machine picking, even though it was not as efficient as hand picking, because it was less costly in over-all terms, much more dependable, and was available at a moments' notice.

Potatoes. Potato harvest mechanization is not as far advanced as snap bean harvest. Perhaps 25 per cent of the early potato crop in the Gilcrest-LaSalle area(Weld County)was mechanized in 1962, according to reports from both growers and shippers. The bulk of the potato crop is still picked by hand labor, especially on those farms that have soil conditions that are not easily adapted to machine handling. Even on those farms that have mechanized the picking process completely, much labor is still used in the grading, sorting, and storing operations. Most of this labor, however, is provided by local workers.

Cucumbers. Cucumber harvest in Colorado is not at all mechanized, so far as could be determined. Most of the cucumber harvest labor is supplied by Mexican nationals, with only an occasional domestic migrant family being so employed. Growers and processors reported that the type of cucumbers grown in Colorado could not be harvested mechanically. New strains of cucumbers that can be picked by machine must be developed before mechanization of harvest activities can be successful. One cucumber processor reported that his company was working on both new strains of cucumbers and new machines in other areas of the country and that some success had been achieved, but the company has no plans at present for introducing these products into Northern Colorado.

Other Crops. Except for red beets, sweet corn, and green peas (all grown for processing), hand labor is used in harvesting the various vegetables grown in the area. The harvest of beets, corn, and green peas is completely mechanized. Dry onions are picked largely by hand, except for some mechanized harvesting (as much as 80 per cent) in late onions around Eaton and Ault (Weld County). One farmer in Eaton reported that the cost of harvesting onions by machine was about one-half the cost of hand harvest.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

In contrast to other areas of the state, few farmers in Northern Colorado expressed concern over the $.90 per hour minimum for Mexican national workers or the effect this minimum had or might have on the wages of domestic workers. The only strong opposition to this minimum wage came from cucumber growers who stated that it tended to eliminate any incentive for workers to produce, since the workers knew that they would be paid 90 cents per hour anyhow. Rather, the growers in Northern Colorado generally were of the opinion that having a reliable, assured labor force was more important in their operations than a minimum wage. These growers indicated that they were willing to pay top wages within their economic ability to do so to workers who were dependable, efficient, and productive. The growers generally favored using domestic workers instead of Mexican nationals, if domestic workers were available. The shortage of available, capable domestics was almost always the reason given for using Mexican nationals. The reasons given by a few growers for preferring to use them were that braceros: 1) were less costly than domestics (because all Mexican nationals are solo workers); 2) were easier to control than domestics; 3) were less demanding of perquisites than domestics; and 4) could be scheduled for a definite period of employment. On the other hand, one of the big advantages cited by growers for using domestics was that domestics could be used in more than one crop activity. Also, growers reported that there were no recruitment fees and usually no transportation fees to be paid for domestic labor, as contrasted with Mexican nationals.

Grower labor problems seem to focus on the availability of capable labor during periods of peak need and the closely related matter of labor rentention during slack periods. Few farmers reported any problems in housing, transporting, and wage rates of domestic workers, although there were some complaints about migrant disrespect for property.

Growers of crops that require especially difficult stoop labor, such as cucumbers, report that it is almost impossible to recruit domestic labor for these tasks. Even though domestic workers are in the area and are not working in other crops, few can be persuaded to pick cucumbers. Consequently, nearly all of the cucumbers in Northern Colorado are harvested by Mexican nationals. This is also the case with respect to the tomato harvest.[2]

The retention of labor during periods of slack employment was not mentioned as a problem by sugar beet growers, but it was discussed by several growers of commercial vegetables, especially those who relied on the workers who lived in the Ft. Lupton labor camp. Growers might have a crew of workers scheduled to work or already employed, but if crop conditions or weather postponed activity for a few days, the workers might not return when needed either because they had found other jobs in the area, had moved away, or had even returned to their home state.

Grower attitudes in Northern Colorado reflect recognition of the importance of the migrant worker in total farm operations. Few, if any, farmers have mechanized their operations to the extent that no labor at all is needed during the growing season. This is especially the case for those growers who raise commercial vegetables. There is no organized effort on the part of the communities and growers which compares with the program of the Mesa County Migrant Council: there is a Weld County Migrant Council, but its organization and programs as yet are not extensive.

---

[2] Only one domestic family out of the 225 interviewed was harvesting cucumbers in 1962, even though several migrant families were interviewed who had come to Colorado for sugar beet pre-harvest, but were going on to Michigan and Ohio for cucumber and tomato harvests.

Many growers individually take an interest in the well-being of their workers and lend their support to organized efforts such as the migrant summer schools in Platteville and Wiggins, the Greeley youth employment program, and the day care center operated in 1962 in conjunction with the Platteville school. The Fort Lupton migrant labor camp operated by the Weld County Public Housing Authority is considered nationally as a model for such camps.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers--Peak Employment Periods

The need for seasonal farm labor in Northern Colorado begins in May and reaches a peak in June during pre-harvest activities in sugar beets. Labor needs in the whole Northern Colorado area then decline throughout the rest of the season, with variations from area to area.

In the area served by the Greeley employment office, the employment peak is reached the second or third week of June. Employment totals then decline 1,000 to 1,300 workers in early July and remain fairly constant at that level until the first or second week of October, or until the potato harvest is finished.

Peak employment in the Ft. Lupton-Longmont-Brighton area is reached the second or third week of June. This total declines early in July by 200 - 500 workers, increases again in late July or early August, and reaches a late season peak about the third week of August. Total seasonal farm labor employment declines sharply in the third and fourth weeks of September and then decreases gradually until all late harvest activities are completed.

The Loveland-Ft. Collins area peak is reached about the middle of June and remains fairly constant until late September. Employment totals in the Ft. Collins area actually increase in early August, but there is a general decline in the Loveland area after completion of pre-harvest activities in sugar beets in June.

The Sterling-Ft. Morgan area peak is reached about the middle of June. This total declines sharply after sugar beet work is completed. The Sterling area totals decline gradually after the second week of July, but employment in the Ft. Morgan area remains fairly constant from July through September and increases slightly in late October.

Peak employment for the area as a whole has declined during the past three years. In 1960 the peak total was 13,004 workers; in 1961 it was 11,443; and in 1962 the total was 10,876 workers. The number and types of workers employed in each of the seven counties throughout the growing season in 1960, 1961, and 1962 are shown in Table 76.

TABLE 76

Total Workers in Northern Colorado by Area, 1960, 1961, 1962

Employment Department Area Office

		Greeley			Ft. Lupton			Longmont			Loveland			Ft. Collins			Denver			Ft. Morgan			Sterling			Totals		
		1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	1960	1961	1962
May	1st week	350	2450	1100	860	635	755	35	125	125	0	45	90	270	245	240	1000	250	215	0	0	75	0	90	95	2515	3840	2,695
	2nd week	1130	1000	1750	1190	570	848	180	465	374	178	145	255	280	330	313	1175	500	345	140	655	600	0	10	100	4273	3675	4,585
	3rd week	2200	1650	2300	500	550	565	355	340	585	440	40	320	350	380	415	1175	450	469	895	925	950	364	35	578	6279	4370	6,182
	4th week	2850	2450	2850	1804	1290	1203	680	725	680	500	420	430	810	460	471	1200	513	545	1365	1365	1500	984	720	1001	10,193	7943	8,680
	5th week			3300			1412			695			517			720			571			1540			1023			9,778
June	1st week	3450	3200	3350	1745	1697	1457	830	895	775	610	535	524	830	829	712	1350	552	565	1550	1697	1575	1083	1100	1185	11,448	10,505	10,143
	2nd week	3600	3400	3410	1865	1840	1560	855	888	816	708	620	523	855	845	875	1900	555	557	1575	1550	1610	1128	1100	1170	12,486	10,798	10,521
	3rd week	3650	3400	3350	1895	1752	1627	980	900	837	731	640	563	995	895	940	2000	533	805	1600	1575	1575	1153	1142	1179	13,004	10,837	10,876
	4th week	3200	3250	3100	1909	1640	1310	947	960	800	639	690	252	1043	1010	875	2000	1156	928	1565	1565	1475	974	1172	986	12,277	11,443	9,726
	5th week	2360	3000		1743	1560		660	718		220	395		790	900		2007	1235		1150	1280		787	1014		9,717	10,102	
July	1st week	2000	2700	2750	1230	1480	1234	405	535	576	88	310	158	658	765	750	1707	1275	1133	573	976	975	231	674	694	6,892	8,715	8,270
	2nd week	2300	2350	2305	1315	1320	1210	315	325	400	304	162	225	727	815	640	1726	1355	1183	1079	830	1015	379	437	542	8,145	7,594	7,560
	3rd week	2700	2500	2250	1365	1500	1184	412	270	370	675	253	320	820	770	755	1900	1600	1224	659	764	893	341	335	413	8,872	7,992	7,409
	4th week	2450	2510	2400	1713	1620	1535	377	580	295	561	576	185	1072	1080	765	1700	1460	1295	559	586	713	263	267	311	8,695	8,679	7,499
August	1st week	2500	2550	2460	2259	1721	1692	377	675	383	421	559	185	1290	1160	1234	1779	1615	1426	459	559	580	125	210	168	9,210	9,049	8,128
	2nd week	2450	2400	2350	2337	2005	1612	335	592	599	532	756	162	1278	870	1256	1775	1690	1483	409	510	530	90	185	171	9,206	9,008	8,163
	3rd week	2450	2500	2300	2323	2135	1907	192	620	263	495	510	165	1227	927	1185	1740	1625	1575	469	560	530	70	60	50	8,966	8,937	7,975
	4th week	2400	2450	2250	2280	1650	1750	197	1419	495	444	433	213	1192	930	1225	1608	1355	1151	569	593	530	110	60	60	8,800	8,890	7,674
	5th week		2500	2300		1957	1529		265	384		212	198		1157	923		1180	1259		596	585		110	60		7,977	7,238
September	1st week	2500	2450	2300	2115	1723	1322	252	260	240	326	207	203	847	1000	719	1600	1125	1138	579	655	605	160	160	120	8,379	7,580	6,647
	2nd week	2600	2350	2150	2105	1536	1199	365	465	464	345	233	225	815	867	710	1603	990	1006	581	675	618	160	110	135	8,474	7,226	6,507
	3rd week	2250	2150	2100	2033	828	981	410	292	363	368	195	195	770	855	481	1500	925	860	571	610	585	120	80	100	8,022	5,935	5,665
	4th week	2200	2050	2100	1885	742	779	485	305	390	261	107	140	715	465	390	1460	880	850	543	510	509	95	60	45	7,644	5,119	5,203
	5th week	2050			1260			355			215			576			1189			664			60			6,369		
October	1st week	2050	2150	2100	1170	660	710	340	395	310	118	135	120	485	440	380	944	755	695	630	650	575	100	100	90	5,837	5,285	4,980
	2nd week	1550	2050	1750	1085	566	561	480	550	390	70	175	95	488	400	375	658	625	620	704	800	650	110	85	85	5,145	5,251	4,526
	3rd week	1000	1650	1450	597	491	442	455	460	377	30	130	105	470	470	465	500	450	450	704	775	750	200	150	100	3,956	4,576	4,139
	4th week	950	1100	700	535	471	378	460	440	350	85	90	95	490	470	450	476	345	380	775	750	750	200	135	100	3,972	3,801	3,203

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment

Sugar Beets. Great Western Sugar Company is the largest single user of seasonal farm labor in Northern Colorado and in the state, as well. Most of the recruitment for interstate domestic labor for sugar beets is conducted by Great Western itself. The employment department recruits for Great Western only in the Panhandle area of Texas and reports that in the past few years from 700 to 800 workers have been recruited annually for Great Western. Great Western recruits labor for its growers in Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and Wyoming in addition to Colorado. All of the Great Western district managers reported that their arrangement with the employment department was satisfactory.

One general comment from the district managers was that it was becoming more and more difficult to recruit domestic labor for sugar beet work. Consequently, the company has had to depend on Mexican nationals to fill its need for seasonal farm labor. One reason for this difficulty was advanced by an employment department representative who was part of the department's recruiting staff in Texas. His opinion was that Great Western did not offer a sufficient advance(transportation, subsistence, and/or loan) in order to be competitive with other users of domestic labor also recruiting in Texas. The workers usually accepted the job offer that provided the biggest advance, no matter where the job offer might take them. This, in effect, created even more of a shortage of domestic workers in Colorado and tended to make the use of more Mexican nationals necessary.

Generally, Great Western bases its labor needs on a 20 acre per man ratio as far as Mexican nationals are concerned. For domestic workers, it is more difficult to make an acre-worker determination, and the one used is 12 to 14 acres per worker. Because of the planting of monogerm seed, an increase in mechanical blocking and thinning, and the use of long handled hoes, one Great Western manager estimated labor needs have been reduced 30 to 40 per cent in the past eight years in his district. Virtually 100 per cent of the domestic workers recruited and employed by Great Western are in family groups. (This category includes an assortment of uncles, cousins, and some more distantly related workers.) At least 95 per cent of the advances made to domestic workers is recouped by the company, according to one of Great Western's managers.

Some of the domestic workers who are employed for sugar beet work remain in the area for other employment, but a sizable proportion of them leave to work in other states or to return to Texas. The employment department has a staff member stationed at the Fort Lupton camp, and one of his functions is to contact these workers. The Fort Lupton employment department manager says these efforts have met with some success.

Great Western pays the recruitment and transportation cost for Mexican nationals. These workers are contracted by the company for sugar beet work only. The six-week contract period is usually completed by late June or early July. These workers are then available for recontracting for other crops. It is estimated that about 15 per cent of the Mexican nationals brought in by Great Western are recontracted.

Potatoes. As far as can be determined, all organized recruitment activities for potato workers are done through the employment department, although many of the workers return each year to growers who previously employed them. There is no organized growers' association that conducts recruitment activities by itself. As in the San Luis Valley potato harvest, many of the workers in the Northern Colorado potato harvest are members of labor crews and do not contact either the employment department or the grower themselves, but rely on the crew leader or labor contractor to make all job arrangements.

Vegetables. Employment in vegetable pre-harvest and harvest activities begins in early July and continues through the first part of September. Recruitment for vegetable work is done through the employment department by Kuner-Empson, Fort Lupton Canning Company, and Western Canning Company.

Labor needs have been reduced substantially by mechanization. Green bean and beet harvests are entirely mechanized, and some of the other harvests are partially mechanized. It was the estimate of the manager of the Fort Lupton Canning Company that labor needs have been reduced by one-half during the past few years. Fort Lupton Canning Campany brings in very few braceros (approximately 15 a year) for work in the late cabbage harvest. This is necessary because many domestic workers leave the area by the end of August or early September. The full cost of recruitment and transportation is paid by the company.

Kuner-Empson officials stated that the number of domestic workers has been declining steadily and that it is increasingly difficult to get local people to work as agricultural laborers. Generally, however, it has not been necessary to use braceros, except for cucumbers and tomatoes. They reported that it is almost impossible to get domestic workers for the harvest of these two crops. They noted also that there has been considerable variation in the productivity of Mexican nationals in the past few years. In fact, they stated that the Mexican nationals who were brought in by Kuner-Empson in 1961 were the poorest workers from Mexico that they ever had. Some of the domestic workers who are employed by Kuner-Empson's growers are also employed in the various canneries, providing employment continuity.

Cucumbers. Out-of-state recruitment for workers to harvest cucumbers is done by the employment department for the four or five cucumber processors. Little success has been noted in any recruitment activity for either interstate, intrastate, or local domestic workers. Almost exclusively, the workers in cucumbers are Mexican nationals. None of the processors advances any money for transportation for domestic workers, as far as can be determined. Rates for picking cucumbers are one half of the crop.

Employment department officials state that the major reasons domestics will not pick cucumbers and tomatoes in Colorado, but will do so in other states, is the method and amount of payment. For example, growers in midwestern states have five different rates of payment according to the size cucumber picked. This method of payment does not prevail in Colorado, where workers usually must harvest the entire crop regardless of size and are paid a fixed per cent of the harvest value.

Mexican Nationals. The inability to attract enough efficient domestic workers to Northern Colorado has led growers and processors to rely on Mexican nationals as a labor force. Sugar beet pre-harvest and cucumber and tomato harvest activities account for the major portion of the nationals who are used. No nationals are used in the potato harvest or in the cherry harvest.

In certain periods during the growing season in the past three years, Mexican nationals made up nearly half of the total labor force in Northern Colorado, and accounted for the majority of the labor force in the Sterling-Ft. Morgan and the Loveland-Ft. Collins areas in 1962. This peak use of Mexican nationals occurred during the major sugar beet pre-harvest work. Table 77 shows the peak employment of Mexican nationals by area for selected weeks in 1962.

Labor Utilization and Reallocation

Some of the domestic labor brought into Northern Colorado for sugar beet pre-harvest by the Great Western Sugar Company is utilized for other crops, especially in the Greeley-Ft. Lupton-Longmont areas, where there are several crops grown requiring large amounts of hand labor.

Most of the domestic workers in the Ft. Morgan-Sterling area leave by the middle of July. Some attempt is made by the employment department to contact these workers and refer them to jobs in the Greeley-Ft. Lupton area, but the majority of the workers interviewed in this area indicated that sugar beets were the only crop they intended to work in while in Colorado. Those who were leaving Colorado, and not going straight home, indicated that they would either go to midwestern states for work or would go to the early potato and onion harvest in west Texas. This employment and travel pattern was also found with those workers interviewed around Loveland and Ft. Collins.

The workers in the Greeley-Ft. Lupton area were the only ones who indicated that they would stay for the vegetable harvests which followed pre-harvest sugar beet activities. The Northern Colorado interviews indicate that there is little in-state migration after an interstate migrant comes to Northern Colorado for sugar beet work.

There is no grower-processor organization in Northern Colorado to compare with Empire Field Crops in the Arkansas Valley, and labor reallocation in crops other than sugar beets is carried out by the employment department. It should be noted that most of the employment department's efforts are concentrated in the Ft. Lupton area and center around the Ft. Lupton camp. The department concentrates on the scheduling and reallocation of labor, often on a day-by-day basis, for three crops: snap beans, dry onions, and potatoes.

The department receives excellent cooperation from growers and processors. Growers and processors try to inform the department of their labor needs as far in advance as possible and also provide information on the number of workers they (the growers and processors) already have who are available. The employment department field men, working through crew leaders and contractors, schedule the work to be performed. Individual workers, thus, know when work is available and where it is located.

TABLE 77

Employment of Mexican Nationals in Northern Colorado
During Selected Weeks, 1962[a]

		Greeley			Ft. Lupton-Longmont-Denver			Loveland-Ft. Collins			Sterling-Ft. Morgan			Total Northern Colorado		
		Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%
May	3rd week	2300	391	17.0	1619	453	27.9	735	341	46.4	1528	731	47.8	6182	1916	30.9
	4th week	2850	749	26.3	2428	622	25.6	901	461	51.2	2501	1727	69.0	8680	3559	41.0
June	2nd week	3410	1169	34.3	2933	1106	37.7	1398	732	52.4	2780	1850	66.5	10521	4857	46.2
	3rd week	3350	1128	33.7	3269	1069	32.7	1503	613	40.8	2461	1832	74.4	10876	4642	42.7
July	2nd week	2305	296	12.8	2793	291	10.4	915	73	7.9	1557	620	39.8	7560	1280	16.9
	4th week	2400	146	6.0	3125	296	9.5	950	98	10.3	1024	289	28.2	7499	829	11.0
Aug.	2nd week	2350	201	8.6	369	390	10.6	1418	167	11.8	701	126	17.9	8163	884	10.8
	4th week	2250	286	12.7	3396	432	12.7	1438	357	24.8	590	46	7.8	7674	1121	14.6
Sept.	2nd week	2150	00	0	2669	222	8.3	935	188	20.1	753	18	2.4	6507	428	6.6
	4th week	2100	00	0	2019	210	10.4	530	0	0	554	9	1.6	5203	219	4.2

a. Per cent of Mexican nationals to total labor force.

Utilization of labor for potato harvest in the Gilcrest-LaSalle area is handled somewhat differently from the area around the Ft. Lupton labor camp. In the Gilcrest-LaSalle area, the majority of potato workers contacted during the field study were in Colorado only for potato harvest. They were members of organized crews and relied upon labor contractors to find work. One contractor in particular seemed to have considerable control over a large portion of the potato harvest work in that area through arrangements with uncles, cousins, brothers and other relatives, each of whom seemed to be in charge of a small crew. These arrangements seemed to work very well, and all of the growers contacted were satisfied. The contractor is well known, as he has been doing the same type of work in the area for several years. This contractor agrees to pick the potatoes, haul them to the shed or dock, and unload them. The 1962 price per hundred weight was 21 to 22 cents. The contractor makes all arrangements with the growers and also with the workers, who receive $.05 per 50-pound sack for picking. The farmers prefer to deal with only one person, as it eliminates having to keep wage records on a score of individual pickers, haulers, and helpers.

It was impossible to arrive at a worker per acre ratio for the early potato harvest in Northern Colorado. Nearly all of this crop is shipped directly to market, and few potatoes are held for storage, as is the usual practice in the San Luis Valley. Consequently, growers try to schedule their harvest on a day-to-day basis to take advantage of favorable market conditions. For example, if a grower or shipper has an order for 1000 sacks of potatoes, he will have only that many sacks picked. If he does not feel that market conditions warrant any further shipments, the workers may be laid off for several days until the shipper or grower has another order or feels that the market can absorb another shipment. This practice makes it almost impossible to arrive at a workers per acre ratio for the potato harvest.

Use of Local Labor. The use of local labor is more widespread in certain parts of Northern Colorado than anywhere else in the state, with the exception of the local labor employed during the peach harvest on the Western Slope. Northern Colorado is more densely populated than any of the other major farm areas of the state and has many more locals upon which to draw.

The employment department area office in Greeley reported that an average of 540 locals were employed during each of the 26 weeks between May 1 and the end of October, 1962, with a peak of 600 workers during June and July and a low of 400 workers at both the beginning and the end of that period.

The Ft. Collins area office reported a weekly average of 430 local workers employed between May and the end of October, with a peak employment of 777 during the first week of August and a low of 185 workers the third and fourth weeks of May. The Denver area office reported an average weekly employment of 735 local workers (utilized mainly in the areas north and northeast of Denver) for this period, with a peak of 1,335 during the third week of August and a low of 160 workers the first week of May. Average weekly employment of locals around Ft. Lupton in the summer of 1962 was 310, with a peak of 491 workers in the third week of August and a low of 145 the last two weeks of October.

The Longmont area office reported an average weekly employment of 233 locals in 1962, with a peak employment of 402 during the second week of September and a low of 114 during the last week of August. It should be noted that the peak employment of locals corresponds very closely to the peak harvest and processing periods in the Longmont, Ft. Lupton, Brighton, and Greeley areas and also to the time when canning factories in those cities are operating.

In the Loveland area, the number of locals employed weekly never exceeded 150, the total reached during the third week of July (cherry harvest). Employment of locals in the Ft. Morgan area averaged 177 per week throughout the season, with a high of 350 during the last two weeks of October (sugar beet harvest) and a low of 25 the first week of May. In the Sterling area, local employment never exceeded 135 (second week of September), but after the fourth week of August, no seasonal farm labor was employed except locals.

Youth Employment Service

The Greeley employment department office operates a program called YES (Youth Employment Service). This is a program to attract junior and senior high school students to take summer time jobs. Recruitment starts well before summer vacation and takes place in the schools. Students fill out a card on which they indicate the type of work preferred. This program is not specifically a program for farm placement, and the farm placements are probably a minor part of the whole program.

There were almost 675 farm placements in 1961, and about 100 placements in 1962 as of early August. Some of the farm placements were in hoeing and thinning cucumbers and beets, but most of the placements were for hay work. The employment department refers these students as it does any other workers, and it is up to the farmer to provide supervision. The farmers seem to have accepted the program, except that some do not pay $1.25 an hour to sixteen-year olds, the wage paid adults.

Wage Rates and Earnings

Domestic workers in Northern Colorado in 1962 were paid mainly by piece rates. Only 42 out of 225 interviewees contacted during the field study were paid by the hour, day, week, or month. All of the other workers were paid by piece rates. Table 78 on the following page shows the diversity in the method of payment for domestic migrants in Northern Colorado in 1962.

TABLE 78

Method of Payment, Migrants Interviewed in Northern Colorado, 1962

Rates and Method of Payment	Number of Workers
$ .80 hour	4
.85 hour	3
.90 hour	13
1.00 hour	9
1.02 hour	1
1.10 hour	2
1.25 hour	7
6.00 day	1
45.00 week	1
250.00 month	1
By Acre	99
By Sack (onions)	4
By Sack (potatoes)	
.01 (loader)	1
.02 (crew leader)	2
.02½ (hauling)	6
.03 (crew leader)	1
.18 (contractor)	1
.22 (contractor)	1
By ½ sack (potatoes)	
.05 (picking)	38
.06 (picking)	1
By bale (hay)	2
By pound (snap beans)	
.02¼	18
By other piece rates	7
	223[a]

[a] Two workers didn't know the rate or method of payment for their work.

Hourly wage rates offered in Northern Colorado increased from 1961 to 1962, but not uniformly. Wage rates for which comparison can be made from the employment department weekly farm bulletins shows fewer jobs being offered at $.75 per hour in 1962 than in 1961 and more offered at $.90 per hour. Vegetable pre-harvest activities in the Ft. Lupton area were offered at $.75 per hour during the last week of May, 1961 and at $.80 - $.90 per hour in the Greeley area. During the corresponding week of 1962, the only rate being offered in both areas was $.90 per hour.

Piece rates for sugar beet pre-harvest work did not change from 1961 to 1962. These rates were the same throughout Colorado as follows:

Block and thin	$15.50 per acre
Hoe Trim	11.50 per acre
Hoeing	9.50 per acre
Weeding	6.00 per acre

The manager of the Great Western district at Ft. Morgan stated that the $.90 per hour guaranteed minimum wage for braceros in 1962 would have no effect on wages paid in his district, since Mexican national beet workers in the Ft. Morgan district in 1961 had averaged $1.18 per hour.[3] The district manager attributed this rate of earnings to the fact that growers in his district plant 90 per cent of their sugar beet acreage with monogerm seed, use mechanical thinning as much as possible, rely heavily on chemical weeding processes, and require little short handled hoe work.

Piece rates for potato harvest remained the same for the years 1961 and 1962. These rates were $.20 -.22 per hundred pounds for delivery at the shed or dock. The contractor paid $.05 per half sack (50-60 pounds) for picking, $.01 to $.02 per 100 pounds for loading, $.025 per 100 pounds for hauling, and perhaps another $.02 to $.03 per 100 pounds to the crew leader for supervision.

Snap bean harvest piece rate wages were the same for both years at $.0225 per pound.

Cucumber harvest rates remained unchanged; these rates have been one-half the graded crop for several years. Due to the few domestic workers who are willing to pick cucumbers, no further comparisons can be made of the rates in this crop.

Piece rates paid for harvest activities in dry onion and fresh market vegetable harvest remained basically the same for the years 1961 and 1962.

Wages Received by Workers. The amount of wages received during the previous week of the workers interviewed in Northern Colorado is shown in Table 79.

TABLE 79

Previous Week's Earnings By Migrants in Northern Colorado, 1962

	Mean	Median	High	Low
Family				
Amount earned	$66.90	$58.00	$248.00	0
Number of workers	3	3	12	1
Amount of hours worked	81.5	80.0	480	0
Amount earned per hour	.820	.725	-	-
Single Worker				
Amount earned	$37.01	$25.00	$175.00	0
Amount of hours worked	40.5	30.0	72	0
Amount earned per hour	.913	.833	-	-

---

3. No separate record of piece rate and/or hourly equivalent earnings are kept for domestic workers as is done for nationals.

Table 79 shows that the working spouse and children contribute quite substantially to the family earning power. The mean hourly wages for the family group as a whole are below those for single workers, because the women and children are not able to produce as much work as adult male workers.

Table 80 shows the mean, median, and high and low average weekly earnings by family group and single worker from April 1, 1962 to the time interviewed.

TABLE 80

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Northern Colorado, 1962

	Family	Single
Mean	$ 39.61	$41.14
Median	34.55	45.00
Low average	3.71	3.33
High average	131.57	95.23

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

Housing for migrant workers in Northern Colorado generally was observed to be the best on an area-wide basis of any in the state. There was some poor housing, however, as was true of the other areas included in the field study.

Ft. Lupton Camp. The Ft. Lupton labor camp is the only one of its kind in the state, both in size and in operation. Following is a description of the camp, its history, and operation summarized from a pamphlet prepared in August of 1961 by J.L. Rice, executive director of the Weld County Housing Authority, which operates the camp.

> #### Historical Background
>
> Plans for farm labor camps were developed by the Resettlement Administration and the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture in the years 1937 to 1940 under the authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriations Act of 1935. As planned, fifty-three camps were completed prior to December, 1942. They were located in Florida, Texas, Colorado, Arizona, California, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. The camps were built for the purpose of housing agricultural laborers and their families, and were located in or near centers of agricultural areas largely devoted to hand-worked crops,

particularly those where labor requirements were on a seasonal basis. Until 1947 they were operated by an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The 79th Congress, by Public Law 731, ordered the liquidation of all federally-owned labor camps by public sale to the highest bidder without regard to their future use. The 80th Congress revised this policy through Public Law 298, which directed the Secretary of Agriculture:

1) to cease direct federal operation of all labor camps;

2) to sell the camps to public agencies, to semi-public agencies, or non-profit associations of farmers who would agree to continue them in operation for the principal purpose of housing agricultural workers; and

3) to issue temporary-use permits to eligible purchasers for the operation of the camps pending sale.

Because purchasers were required to operate these camps for the principal purpose of housing agricultural workers, they /the camps7 were offered at discounts ranging from 80 to 90 per cent of their original cost (the local camp, constructed at a cost of $350,000.00, was offered to a farm organization for $42,000.00 -- a discount of 88 per cent). Despite the apparent fairness of such offers, only a few camps were sold under this provision. The next (81st) Congress abandoned this policy through the enactment of Public Law 475, by which all farm labor camps were transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Public Housing Administration for disposition by sale to public housing agencies.

General Assembly Action. On March 28,1951, Senate Bill No. 283, titled "An Act to Create County Housing Authorities to Acquire Federal Labor Camps...." was enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado. Pursuant to a provision of that bill, the Housing Authority of Weld County was created on June 6,1951. Five commissioners - E.G. Dittmer, Floyd Koshio, Elton Miller, Herman Scheid, and W.E. Scott - constitute the Authority, which is a public body, corporate and politic, possessing all powers necessary to exercise essential governmental functions and carry out the purposes for which it was established. The commissioners, appointed for terms of five years, receive no compensation for their services.

On July 1, 1951, in accordance with a provision of Public Law 475, the Authority entered into a contract for purchase and sale of the camp with the Public Housing Administration. By the terms of the sale, the Authority was required: 1) to assume responsibility for the operation of the camp; 2) to make all repairs, replacements, additions, and improvements necessary to preserve its value and provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for its occupants; and 3) to pay annually to the federal government all net income from the operation until December 31, 1971, at which time, according to the sales agreement, the project would be conveyed to the Authority.

Public Law 1020 (the Housing Act of 1956), by which the Housing Act of 1937 was amended, constituted a qualified authorization for the PHA to transfer all its rights, title, and interest in farm labor camps to eligible public housing agencies. As a consequence this amendment, all obligations imposed by the above-mentioned purchase and sale contract were canceled, and title to the camp was conveyed by the PHA to the Authority on October 17, 1956.

Description of the Fort Lupton Camp

The Fort Lupton Farm Labor Camp is located on the north side of the town of Fort Lupton and lies just east of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Twenty-six per cent of the camp is within the corporate limits of the town.

In addition to a community center building and several offices, the camp provides the following housing accommodations:

1. Eight three-bedroom units, 24' x 36'.
2. One three-bedroom unit, 22' x 40'.
3. Sixteen two-bedroom units, 26' x 30'; 5'x 10'.
4. Twenty-two duplexes, 20' x 26'.
5. One hundred and two one-room shelters, 14' x 16'.
6. One hundred one-room shelters, 12' x 18'.
7. Eight one-room shelters, 14' x 20'.
8. Fifteen tent platforms, concrete, 16' x 16'.

The camp provides the following sanitary facilities for residents of the shelter area:

Water Closets	18
Lavatories	48
Showers	54
Laundry Tubs, double	36
Urinals	6

Occupancy

Occupancy of the camp is predominantly Spanish-American; however, as of August 21, 1961, eighteen units were occupied by Sioux Indians, from the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, and seven units were occupied by Kickapoo Indians from a reservation near Muzquiz, Mexico (approximately 100 miles southwest of Eagle Pass, Texas).[a]

Mexican nationals. From May 1 to June 15, annually, about 9,500 Mexican nationals pass through the camp en route to beet fields in Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Montana. Upon completion of their assigned work in those areas, they are returned to the camp, where they may be released by the prime contractor to local growers and vegetable processors for further work assignments, or they may be returned immediately to Mexico. Despite the contractual provision for such transfers, less than five per cent of this labor is recontracted locally.

The current population of the shelter area (1,135; of which 681 are over 14 years of age) is made up largely of family groups from Texas.[b] Of the total occupancy, the ratio of workers to non-workers is one and one-half to one.

Unit Furnishings and Rent. Each of the 210 units comprising the shelter area is equipped with a wood-burning cooking stove or a three-burner gas plate, three cots, and a kitchen table.[c] None have running water. The units equipped with gas plates rent for $5.00 weekly; the others rent for $4.50. Such units may be occupied by individuals or groups of six or less.

Rentals constitute the only source of income. However, 30 per cent of the improvements and additions were financed through donations by the following organizations: Lupton Farm Improvement Association, Kuner-Empson Company, Fort Lupton Canning Company, Western Food Products Company, Great Western Sugar Company, and Fresh Vegetable Package Company.

---

a. The date of this report.
b. As of the date of this report, August 21, 1961.
c. All units now have gas plates.

The camp is exempt from taxation. Nevertheless, in accordance with a provision of Senate Bill No. 283,[d] the Authority makes annual payments in lieu of taxes to local taxing bodies. Such payments equal 10 per cent of the camp's aggregate annual shelter rent.

Other Agencies and Programs

Through an arrangement with the Colorado State Employment Service, one of its employees is assigned to the camp office -- from June to October, annually -- where he performs a placement service mutually beneficial to camp residents and local farmers.

Educational and recreational programs for the migrant children of the camp are sponsored, planned, and conducted by the Colorado Council of Churches and the Catholic Church.

The health and sanitation departments of Weld County provide the following services for migrants occupying camp shelter:

1) education in sanitation;
2) clinics for pre-natal and post-natal care:
3) vaccines, whenever warranted by local conditions;
4) detection and control of venereal disease through blood tests and the use of penicillin; and
5) education in the selection and preparation of food.

---

[d] Section 7. "....In lieu of taxes on its property the Authority may agree to make such annual payments to the taxing bodies in which the labor camp is situated as it finds consistent with the maintenance of the low-rent character of the labor camps or the achievement of the purposes of this Act."

There is practically no migrant on-the-farm housing between Ft. Lupton and Brighton to the south. There are several old houses in this area that probably were used for migrant housing some years ago. Almost all of the workers in the Ft. Lupton area live in the camp.

Other Camps. There are several other labor camps in the Ft. Collins-Greeley area. These camps provide housing primarily, if not solely, for the cucumber workers (usually Mexican nationals) in that area. Some domestic workers were living in at least two of these camps in 1962. These camps are owned and operated by the cucumber processors. They appear well maintained and in good condition, with the exception of certain facilities at the camp at Windsor. There, several complaints were heard about the closeness of the privies to the living quarters. The privies are located only about 20 feet from the housing units.

Other Housing. Most of the migrant housing in Northern Colorado is located on individual farms. This housing, with some exceptions, is of better quality and is better maintained than migrant housing in other parts of the state.

Table 81 shows the number of housing inspections made in Northern Colorado in 1962 and the condition of such housing as determined by the department.

TABLE 81

State Department of Employment Housing Inspections, Northern Colorado, 1962

		Condition of Housing				
Local Office	No. of Inspections	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Inspections Prohibited
Brighton-Ft. Lupton	546	419	113	13	1	0
Denver	42	27	10	5	0	0
Ft. Collins	182	90	87	5	0	1
Ft. Morgan	325	192	128	5	0	0
Greeley	991	586	349	50	6	7
Longmont	157	102	47	7	1	0
Loveland	53	38	14	1	0	0
Sterling	223	90	109	24	0	0
Total	2519	1544	857	110	8	8

A large number of recent migrant housing repairs were observed during the 1962 field study in Northern Colorado. It is not known the extent to which these repairs were the result of the employment department's housing inspection and resulting report of deficiencies to the grower. This appeared to be true in some cases, while in others, the growers have made it a practice to keep their housing in good repair

Health Programs and Needs

There are several organized local health units in Northern Colorado, not all of which, however, are actively concerned with migrant health and sanitation.

Northeast Colorado Health Department. This department covers the counties of Logan, Morgan, Phillips, Sedgwick, Washington, and Yuma and has headquarters in Sterling. There is no organized program for migrant health care in the district, nor is there any migrant housing and/or sanitation inspection performed, except on complaint. The department's director stated that domestic migrants coming into Colorado should have a health card showing date of last physical examination, immunization, physical defects, diseases, etc. He also suggested that domestic workers who are tubercular or have any serious contagious malady should not be allowed to enter the state. He added that there had been an occasional problem in the past with tubercular migrants. He did not think it quite fair for domestic migrants to expect or receive free health services while in Colorado, since they received none in their home states.

Weld County Health Department. The Weld County Department provides the following services for domestic migrants in the Ft. Lupton camp:

1) education in sanitation;
2) clinic for pre-natal and post-natal care;
3) vaccines whenever warranted by local conditions;
4) detection and control of venereal disease through blood tests and the use of penicillin; and
5) education in the selection and preparation of food.

These services are confined to the Ft. Lupton camp and are not extended to other parts of the county. No inspection of housing or sanitation is made, except on complaint.

The director of the department said that few cases of TB were ever reported among the domestic migrants and that there was a very low incidence of venereal disease. The nurse in charge of the clinic at Ft. Lupton said that a common complaint from the domestic workers was dermatitis caused by the use of sprayed or dusted chemicals.

Tri-County Health Department. This unit is formed from the health departments of Adams, Arapahoe, and Jefferson counties. It has no program for migrant health care or education and performs no housing or sanitation inspection services, except on complaint.

Boulder County Health Department. The Boulder County Health Department has no program for migrant health care or education for those migrants in the eastern part of the county around Longmont. It performs no housing or sanitation inspection services, except on complaint.

Larimer County Health Department. This unit has no special program for the health needs of migrant workers but did provide some immunizations and pre and post-natal care at its headquarters in Ft. Collins. These are general services for the community as a whole, and no special effort is made to inform migrants of the facilities available, and no records are kept on how many migrants take advantage of these services.

Only 38 of the 225 migrants interviewed in Northern Colorado in 1962 reported any sickness or injury incurred by themselves or any member of their families since coming to Colorado. Twenty-four reported specific illnesses, and 21 of these either visited a doctor or the Fort Lupton clinic. The other three did nothing. Nineteen of the 21 who visited a doctor or the clinic did not pay for doctor's care.

Fourteen injury cases were reported by interviewees, and all 14 injuries were seen by a doctor. In seven of these cases, the injured migrant paid for the doctor's services. Most of these injuries were sprains; the most serious injury was a gunshot wound in the leg.

Education and Welfare

Migrant Schools

Two schools for migrant workers were operated in Northern Colorado during 1962, one at Wiggins and one at Platteville.

Wiggins School. The Wiggins school for migrant children was established in 1955 and has operated each summer since. In 1961, there was a total enrollment of 57 students, and three teachers were employed. In 1962, a maximum enrollment of about 50 students was expected, with two or three teachers as needed. The 1962 session started on May 28 and continued through July 9. The school buses which transport the children to and from school each day go as far as seven miles north and about 15 miles south of town.

All of the students enrolled in 1961 and 1962 were Spanish American and were from the Rio Grande valley of Texas. About 40 per cent of the students attending the 1961 session had been there one or more previous years, but, in 1962, only about 25 per cent of the students had been in the Wiggins school before. The principal attributed the decline in attendance to the fact that fewer domestic and more foreign workers were being employed in the Wiggins area in 1962. Migrant students at the Wiggins school in 1962 were between the ages of five and 15 years.

The principal at Wiggins stated that one of the big problems in designing a curriculum for migrant students was the lack of adequate information concerning the student's previous education. Very few of the new students at any of the summer schools had any previous school record. The children who attended the Wiggins school sessions were all given a report card of their work while there to take with them to their next place of travel or to their home state. The principal stated that one very helpful tool in teaching the migrant children would be a standardized report card that could be used in the several states and schools through which the children may pass.

Community acceptance of the migrant school has always been very good, even when it was first established, according to statements from the principal and teachers. The school officials have encountered more reluctance from the parents of migrant children than from the local school district members in getting the children into school. The principal remarked that in some cases where the migrant parents did not speak English and had no schooling themselves, they were reluctant to have their children attend school. However, the reverse was more often true. Many parents were glad to send their children to school, even for the short time offered.

Platteville School. The 1962 session was the first session for migrant children held at the Platteville school. In previous years, a summer school for migrants had been held in Fort Lupton. This school was not operated this year, and the migrant school program was transferred to Platteville, nine miles from Fort Lupton. The children who would have attended the Fort Lupton school were transported to Platteville. The students enrolled at the Platteville school came mainly from the

Ft. Lupton camp, but one bus route was extended north and northeast of Platteville as far as LaSalle. Several children were enrolled from this area who probably would not have attended the Ft. Lupton school, had it been operated there again in 1962.

The school opened on June 25 and continued through August 10. Attendance in the early weeks of the session averaged about 55 per day, but, by the time the school closed in August, the daily attendance had risen to over 100 students per day. A total of 210 different migrant children were enrolled at the Platteville school in 1962.

One of the reasons advanced for the closing of the Ft. Lupton migrant summer school in 1962 was the fact that many of the children who lived in the camp attended not only the special summer term but also enrolled in the regular fall school term. This, in effect, doubled the load upon the local district's facilities. In 1962, it was decided that no special term would be held, but that all of the children living in the Ft. Lupton camp when the regular full term started in September would be accepted into the regular school. These children in the regular term usually stay from four to six weeks before their families return to their home state.

In addition to the special migrant summer school, a day care program for preschool children (two years to six years) was operated at the Platteville school. This program was organized and operated by the Weld County Migrant Council and was staffed by volunteer workers. The purpose of this program was to free parents for work, as well as some of the older children, so that they could work or attend the summer school.

Need for Migrant Summer Schools

One basis on which estimates of the need for additional migrant summer schools can be made is the number of migrant workers in those areas without such schools.

In the Brush-Ft. Morgan area (visited June 4 to June 15), 40 migrant families were interviewed. These 40 families reported 42 children between six and 16 years present with them. Eight of these children were enrolled in the Wiggins school, which left 34 school age children not in school from the 40 families interviewed.

In the Sterling area, eight interviewed families had 24 school age children with them.

In the Ovid-Sedgwick-Julesburg area, 20 families reported 35 school age children with them in Colorado. The Sterling to Julesburg area interviews were conducted during the last two weeks of June.

Fourteen families with 25 school age children were interviewed in the Loveland-Ft. Collins area during the first two weeks of July.

During the last two weeks of July and the first 10 days of August, interviews were conducted in the Longmont-Ft. Lupton-Brighton area. No enumeration of the number of children was compiled, because the migrants living in that area had access to the Platteville summer school.

In the remaining weeks of August, interviews were made in areas around Greeley. The results of these interviews show 41 families with 94 school age children in the Greeley area; four families with five children in the Eaton area; two families with four children in the Milliken area; and 10 families with 13 school age children in the Windsor area.

So far as could be determined from talking with county school superintendents, there are no plans for establishing any more schools for migrant children in Northern Colorado, with the possible exception of the Brush-Ft. Morgan area. The county superintendent for Morgan County stated that there had been some discussion of starting another school in Morgan County (in addition to the one at Wiggins) but that no definite proposals had been considered.

Migrant Attitude Toward Education

Each family migrant interviewed was asked questions concerning his own schooling achievement and how much schooling he would like his children to have. Slightly over half of them had set a goal of high school graduation or more for their children. Eighteen per cent felt that an eighth grade education or less was sufficient for their children. The attitudes of 200 families interviewed in Northern Colorado toward their children's education are shown in Table 82 on the following page.

The mean number of years of schooling for all interviewees was 3.2 years, and the median was 3.0 years. The mean number of years of schooling for the family interviewees was 2.96, and the median was 3.0 years. The mean years of schooling for single workers was 5.1 years, and the median was 5.0 years. Sixty-four family interviewees and three single workers reported that they had attended school for less than one year or had never attended school at all.

Welfare

Welfare help to migrant workers in Northern Colorado during 1961 and 1962 amounted to $341.17 in cash and grocery assistance, plus additional assistance in the form of surplus commodities. All of this assistance was provided by the Weld County Department of Welfare. Cash payments of $302.69 were dispensed to four different migrant families in 1961, but no cash payments were made in 1962. Grocery orders of $38.48 were allowed in 1961, but all of the 1962 assistance reported was in the form of surplus commodities.

TABLE 82

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education For
Their Children, Northern Colorado, 1962

Migrant's Years of School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend																		
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	College	Till He is 16	As Much As Possible	Until He Wishes to Quit	N.A.	Total
0							5		9		1		15		1	5	2	13	51
1							2	1	1		1		14	2		1		2	24
2							3		4				9			1		5	22
3							3		4	2			17			3	1	2	32
4									1		3		9			1		1	15
5									3			1	6	2		1	2	2	17
6													12						12
7													7			1		2	10
8													6				1	2	9
9													1					3	4
10																			
11													2					1	3
12													1						1
Total							13	1	22	2	5	1	99	4	1	13	6	33	200

The Migrant

All of the 225 interviewees contacted in Northern Colorado in 1962 were Spanish-American. Two of the interviews were with Kickapoo Indians from Muzquiz, Mexico, but these were counted as Spanish-American since the Kickapoo Indians have dual Mexican-United States citizenship.

Two hundred of the interviews were completed with family members and 25 with single workers. The number of workers covered in the study sample are shown in Table 83.

TABLE 83

Number of Workers and Number of People Included, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number of Workers	280	225	146	651
Per Cent	43.0	34.6	22.4	100.0
Number of People	346	280	688	1314
Per Cent	26.3	21.3	52.4	100.0

Years as a Migrant Worker

Table 84 shows the years that each of the 225 interviewees had been working as a seasonal farm worker and the number of years each had worked as a seasonal farm worker in Colorado. Twenty three per cent reported that 1962 was the first year they had worked in Colorado, and more than 24 per cent of the persons interviewed reported that Colorado was one, if not the only, state they had worked in throughout their careers as seasonal farm workers.

The mean age of the interviewees was 39.4 years, and the median was 40 years. The mean age for married interviewees was 40.7 years and the median 41 years. The mean age for the 25 single migrants was 28.8 years, and the median age was 23 years.

Table 85 shows the number of years as a migrant worker by age of the interviewee.

TABLE 84

Number of Years as a Migrant Worker and Number of Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado, Northern Colorado, 1962

Total Years As A Migrant Worker	Years In Colorado 0		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		More Than 10		Total	
	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S
0	9	2																							9	2
1	7		3																						10	
2	2		3		3																				8	
3	3		2		3		3	1																	11	1
4	4		3	1			1		2	2															10	3
5	1								3		2															
6	3	1	1		1		1		1		2		5												14	1
7	2		1		1		1						3		4	2									12	2
8	2		1		1	1					2				1		4	1							11	2
9	1	1			1		1		1		1								5	1					10	2
10	2	2	2	1			2				1		1		1						2	1			11	4
11							3		1						1		1		1				3	1	10	1
12	2			1	1		1		1								1					1	2		8	2
13							1														2		2		5	
14					1		1																1	1	3	1
15	4		1		1		1		1			1	1		4		2				1				16	1
More than 15	4		8		7		3		2		3		3		4		3	1			1		8	2	46	3
Total	46	6	25	3	20	1	19	1	12	2	11	1	13	0	15	2	11	2	6	1	6	2	16	4	200	25

TABLE 85

Years as a Migrant Worker by Age of Interviewee, Northern Colorado, 1962

Total Years As A Migrant	Age of Interviewee						
	Under 20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	Over 61	Total
0	2	1	6	1	1		11
1	2	4	1	3			10
2	1		4	1	2		8
3		4	5	2	1		12
4	3	2	2	4	2		13
5		1	3	2			6
6	1	3	2	5	4		15
7		7	3	2	1		13
8		5	2	3	3		13
9	2	4	2	2		2	12
10	1	5	4	3	1	1	15
11-15	1	11	11	12	11	3	49
16-20		4	5	10	4	2	25
21-25				2		1	3
26-30			1	5	3	1	10
Over 31				4	4	2	10
Total	13	51	51	61	37	12	225

Home State

Texas was the home state of the great majority of the workers contacted in 1962 in Northern Colorado. One hundred and ninety families and all 25 single workers reported Texas as their home state. (The Kickapoo Indians are counted as Texas migrants.) The other 10 families reported their home states as follows: five were from New Mexico, four from Colorado (San Luis Valley), and one from California.

Length of Time in Colorado

Table 86 shows the length of stay in Colorado by time of arrival in Northern Colorado.

Only two persons indicated that they would stay less than one month in Colorado, while 29 intended to stay six months or longer. The mean length of stay for the 189 interviewees who had fairly definite plans for leaving was 3.6 months, and the median was 3.5 months.

TABLE 86

Length of Stay in Colorado by Time of Arrival, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Month of Arrival	Length of Stay in Months Less Than 1 Mo.	1-2 Mo.	2-3 Mo.	3-4 Mo.	4-5 Mo.	5-6 Mo.	More Than 6 Mo.	No Date Given	Total
January							3	1	4
February							1		1
March							3	3	6
April			1	4	4	9	14	2	34
May		5	21	11	14	19	8	16	94
June		1		5	4	1			11
July	1	10	21	11				9	52
August	1	12	3	2					18
No Date Given								5	5
Total	2	28	46	33	22	29	29	36	225

Reasons for Working in Colorado

Table 87 shows the reasons expressed for preferring to work or not preferring to work in Colorado.

TABLE 87

Reason for Working in Colorado, Northern Colorado Interviews, 1962

Reason Given	Prefer Working In Colorado	Do Not Prefer Working in Colorado
Wages	54	15
Housing	9	4
Type of Crops	69	5
Length of Season	3	
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	29	
Community Attitudes	3	
Weather	25	6
Other	38	5

Types of crops and wages were given as the main reason for preferring to work in Colorado, and wages were the principal reason for not preferring to work in Colorado.

Reasons for Returning to Colorado

Table 88 shows the reasons given by interviewees for planning to return to Colorado next year.

TABLE 88

Return to Colorado Next Year, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Reason Given	Will Return Next Year	Will Not Return Next Year
Wages	40	9
Housing	8	4
Types of Crops	64	10
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	64	7
Community Attitude	1	
Other	21	14

The seasonal farm workers in Northern Colorado evidently care little about community attitudes toward them, for only one indicated that this was a factor in his decision to plan to return next year, and only three cited the community's attitude as a reason for preferring to work in Colorado.

Reasons For Doing Seasonal Farm Work

The fact that they would be unemployed unless they did seasonal farm work was the main reason cited by the migrant workers in Northern Colorado when asked why they were seasonal farm laborers. Only 14 out of the 225 people interviewed said they had no other job skills, and 46 of them said they could make more money in seasonal farm work than by any other means. Table 89 lists the reasons given for doing seasonal farm work by the 225 interviewees in Northern Colorado in 1962.

TABLE 89

Reasons For Doing Seasonal Farm Work, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Reason	Family	Single	Total
No Other Job Skills	14		14
Able to Make More Money Than By Other Work	40	6	46
Would be Unemployed Otherwise	131	13	144
Enjoy it	9	4	13
Other	15	4	19

Winter Employment

Table 90 presents a compilation of the 1961-1962 winter employment of 225 Northern Colorado interviewees. Not all of the interviewees answered this question.

TABLE 90

Winter Work of Seasonal Farm Laborers, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Type of Job	Family	Single	Total
Farm	92	7	99
Factory	11	2	13
Housework for Wages	5		5
Odd Jobs	18	2	20
No Work	1		1
Other	50	10	60

Table 91 shows the 1961-1962 number of weeks worked during the winter and the amount of money earned by the migrants interviewed in Northern Colorado.

TABLE 91

Weeks Worked During 1961-1962 Winter and Amount Earned, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

	Weeks Worked		Amount Earned	
	Family	Single	Family	Single
Mean	8.8	10.2	$ 391.89	$ 659.10
Median	8.0	10.0	275.00	525.00
Low	0	0	0	0
High	22	22	2,050.00	1,500.00

The Migrant and the Community

The seasonal farm workers in Northern Colorado generally are well received by the community in the area, even though there are no community organizations devoted to migrant programs which compare with the Mesa County Migrant Council.

The Weld County Migrant Council is the only organized citizens' group in Northern Colorado concerned with migrant welfare and conditions. This group appears to be not as well organized as the Mesa County Council and has initiated and participated in very few projects.

Comments from growers and community leaders at the June 1, 1962 meeting in Brush indicated that the migrant workers were welcome to use the facilities of the local parks and playing fields, although there were no programs especially for the workers, and no attempts are made to acquaint the workers with the facilities available.

Growers and community officials in the Ft. Lupton area were the most outspoken about the need for the migrant workers in their area. They recognized that the worker is an indispensable part of the area's agricultural economy and indicated that steps have been taken to make the worker feel welcome while he is in Colorado. A spokesman for the town council of Ft. Lupton said that the Ft. Lupton camp had overloaded the town's sewer system in 1961 and that some of the sewer lines had been replaced since then to insure that the situation did not occur again. Also, several streets in the vicinity of the camp had recently been paved to reduce the dust problem, which benefited the camp residents as well as the town's permanent citizenry.

The inability of many Spanish-American migrants to speak English was cited as a reason for the lack of better relations between the workers and the community at the Migrant Labor Committee's Greeley regional meeting. This failure to converse in English apparently has heightened the Anglo and Spanish-American cultural differences in the eyes of some people, leading to more strained relationships.

Programs for Migrants

Educational and recreational programs for the children in the Ft. Lupton area are sponsored, planned, and conducted by the Colorado Council of Churches and by the Catholic Church.

The Migrant Ministry of the Council of Churches conducts various programs at the Ft. Lupton camp and assists in any way it can to ease some of the burden of the migrant workers. The Migrant Ministry held rummage sales, provided class instruction in mechanics and in sewing, provided free movies, had organized recreational programs, and provided religious instruction. The Ministry also made used clothing and bedding available in some cases. The director of the Migrant Ministry for Colorado said that community acceptance of these programs had been very heartening and hoped that they could be extended into areas of Colorado not now served.

The Catholic Church provided similar programs to those of the Migrant Ministry, with perhaps more emphasis being placed upon religious instruction. In addition to the general programs at the Ft. Lupton camp, the Catholic Church also conducted a three-week class of religious instruction for migrant children in the Greeley area. Two buses were used to transport the children from surrounding farms to Greeley for these classes.

Law Enforcement Problems

Law enforcement officials in all parts of Northern Colorado reported few problems, if any, with the migrant workers who came to their areas. The state patrol said that transportation of workers is no longer the problem it was several years ago, since most workers come to the state in their own automobiles, and only a small per cent of them come in on crew leaders' or contractors' trucks. All trucks that do enter the state, however, must comply with ICC regulations concerning safety, loading, and rest stops. Drinking, in contrast to comments received in other parts of the state, was not cited as a major cause of concern by law enforcement officials.

THE SEASONAL FARM LABOR MARKET

Importance of Farm Labor Market Organization

The organization of the farm labor market has been given special attention in this study, because the economic well-being of both growers and workers depends to a great extent on the effective recruitment, allocation, and utilization of seasonal farm labor.

The grower needs an assured labor supply, especially at certain critical periods during the growing season; otherwise, he may suffer crop loss both in quantity and quality. The growers' labor needs in Colorado may be greater proportionally in this respect than in some other states where the same crops are grown. Mechanization and technological improvement have altered the farm labor picture considerably in recent years by reducing the need for seasonal farm labor, but not to the extent that labor needs have been reduced in some other states. The worker needs continuous employment in order to have some possibility of maintaining himself and his family during the growing season and to attempt to lay aside some savings for the winter months.

Relationship of Employment Pattern and Earnings

All of the migrants interviewed during the field study were asked how much they and their families earned both during the week preceding the interview and for the entire period from April until the time they were interviewed. Earnings during the preceding week were usually good (except for the Western Slope where peach harvest had started toward the end of the week, with little prior work available, and the San Juan Basin where bad weather slowed up bean harvest), because the interviews in each area were made during a period of peak labor needs and employment was usually available. The effect of periods of non-work on the income of interstate migrant workers, especially family groups, can be seen by comparing average (median) earnings during the previous week with the average (median) weekly earnings from April 1 until the time of the interview.

This comparison is shown by area in which interviewed for both family groups and single workers in Table 92.

In each area, the average weekly earnings for family groups from April 1 until the time of interview were much less than the average amount earned during the preceding week. The difference was as much as 71 per cent in one area and, in all others except one, was more than 40 per cent. The one exception was the Western Slope, where, as previously indicated, most workers did not work full time during the preceding week.

Differences Between Family and Single Workers. The picture was different for single workers. Except for the San Luis Valley, the average weekly earnings since April 1 exceeded the average amount earned during the previous week. (In the San Luis Valley, many of the single workers interviewed, particularly during the late season, had not been actively seeking employment prior to the period during which they were interviewed.)

TABLE 92

Comparison of Earnings During Previous Week With Average Weekly Earnings From April 1 Until Time of Interview, Migrant Labor Interviews By Area, 1961 and 1962

	Family Groups			Single Workers		
Area	Earnings Previous Week[a]	Weekly Earnings Since April 1[a]	Pct. of Difference	Earnings Previous Week[a]	Weekly Earnings Since April 1[a]	Pct. of Difference
Arkansas Valley	$82.00	$27.25	-66.8%	$25.00	$25.00	--
San Luis Valley (Early Season)[b]	50.00	29.44	-41.1	40.00	18.75	-53.1%
San Luis Valley (Late Season)[c]	95.00	27.58	-71.0	48.00	8.00	-83.3
Western Slope	20.00	15.71	-21.5	10.00	12.00	+20.0
San Juan Basin	24.00	9.72	-59.5	12.00	19.57	+63.1
Northern Colorado	58.00	34.55	-40.4	25.00	45.00	+80.0

---

a. Median earnings
b. July-August
c. September-October

The difference in earning patterns between family groups and single workers may be explained by one or both of the following:

1) During periods of slack employment, it is likely that only the adult male member of a family group will find work. The crop and type of work will also affect the employment of women and children in family groups. Consequently, the adult male may have been the only one in the family to have worked at all regularly prior to the period in which the interview took place, when usually two or three or even more family members were employed.

2) Generally, single workers did not feel the economic necessity as greatly as did family members to work on a full-time basis during peak periods when employment was available. (This is substantiated by the fact that the interviews showed that single workers were employed fewer hours on the average during the preceding week than individual family members.) If such is the case, earnings during the preceding week would be lower in proportion to weekly earnings since April 1 than they would have been, had the single worker been employed for as many hours as family members.

Reasons for Differences in Family Group Weekly Earnings. There are several reasons why the average weekly earnings of family members from April 1 until the time of interview were as low as shown in Table 92. Climatic conditions, as might be expected, were a major factor in periods of non-employment. Travel also caused a number of non-work days. Some of these groups had arrived in a particular area prior to the time work was available, either through misinformation or misunderstanding or because they assumed work would be available without checking with the employment department or any other possible source of information. Often, this early arrival was the fault of a labor contractor or crew leader. Some of these workers had left an area in another state while employment was still available only to find no work at the time of their arrival in Colorado. In many instances, when such movements occurred, the workers or their crew leaders were following a travel and employment pattern of many years standing without being informed of delays caused by climatic conditions or changes in labor needs. In some cases, domestic family groups preferred not to take the work available, because either they didn't like the crop activity and/or the amount and method of payment, or because they were waiting for other employment which had been promised.

Worker Guarantees

Domestic workers and the growers who employ them have none of the protection and guarantees provided by federal law for the employment of Mexican nationals, other foreign workers, and Puerto Ricans. Foreign workers and Puerto Ricans employed as farm laborers receive guarantees as to transportation, insurance, wage rates, and the minimum amount of employment which will be provided during the contract period. In other words, these workers are guaranteed payment for a specified number of hours of work at a specified rate, even if that amount of work is not available because of climatic conditions or other reasons. The grower is guaranteed that the workers will perform as specified in the contract, and, if they refuse to work or are otherwise unsatisfactory, replacements will be provided. It should be noted that these agreements apply to single workers rather than family groups.

Federal legislation was introduced in 1961 to establish contractual relationships and guarantees for domestic workers. This measure provided that growers and domestic workers could participate in the program on a voluntary basis. This measure, however, was not reported out by the U. S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Annual Worker Plan

The Annual Worker Plan represents another approach to the two-fold problem of providing: 1) an assured supply of domestic labor to growers; and 2) continuous steady employment to domestic workers. This plan was introduced nationwide by the Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor, and its affiliated state employment departments in 1954. The purposes of the plan are "to help provide a dependable labor supply to farm employers and to increase the employment opportunities of migrant farm workers by arranging successive job referrals."[1]

As part of the plan, interviews are conducted with migrant groups in their home areas and in their places of employment for the primary purpose of providing continuous employment for the group. Information collected on the origin, size, composition, previous employment pattern, future job commitments, and other characteristics of each work crew is entered on a migratory labor employment record. Copies of this record are distributed to the crew leader's state of residence, as well as to other states in the crew's itinerary. In this way, states where the migrants are employed can develop information on this component of the seasonal work force, and home states can accumulate data on the number, characteristics, and movement of their own residents who are migratory workers.[2]

While the Annual Worker Plan represents a significant step toward rationalizing at least a portion of the farm labor market, it has not been as successful as its framers had hoped, and some states, including Colorado, have not participated in the program to the extent which might be expected, considering the number of domestic workers who come to this state each year. Table 93 shows by state the number of migrants contacted and employed under the Annual Worker Plan in 1960.

Table 93 shows that Colorado contacted very few crew leaders in comparison with a number of states whose labor needs are somewhat similar, such as Idaho, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin. Fewer migrants were employed in Colorado under the Annual Worker Plan in relation to the total number of contacts made than in any of the states mentioned above or in several others as well.

---

1. The Annual Worker Plan in 1960, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Program Review and Analysis, April 1, 1961.
2. Ibid.

TABLE 93

Annual Worker Plan: Migrants Contacted and Employed, by State, 1960[a]

	Number of Migrant Contacts[b]				Migrants Employed		
State	Total	Crew Leaders	Family Heads	Other	Families	Single Males	Single Females
Total	15,512	9,597	4,997	918	--	--	--
Alabama	289	171	2	116	319	325	183
Arizona	138	54	80	4	409	430	25
Arkansas	515	294	200	21	751	3,040	497
California	112	33	72	7	313	577	10
Colorado	370	107	246	17	558	677	18
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	233	214	16	3	974	2,001	551
Florida	591	575	1	15	4,340	12,447	2,632
Georgia	110	69	12	29	184	1,375	221
Idaho	815	519	291	5	1,782	1,242	135
Illinois	405	124	274	7	1,086	526	133
Indiana	418	264	135	19	1,427	1,201	331
Iowa	189	79	107	3	279	173	6
Kansas	78	38	40	0	137	130	70
Kentucky	32	29	2	1	106	317	43
Louisiana	262	221	28	13	310	1,392	361
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	376	353	23	0	761	2,276	521
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	331	143	187	1	9,867	3,968	665
Minnesota	299	43	255	1	567	176	10
Mississippi	517	288	6	223	8	30	20
Missouri	372	229	142	1	1,004	1,964	282
Montana	282	68	197	17	401	207	35
Nebraska	102	61	40	1	147	33	13
Nevada	15	6	9	0	44	58	9
New Hampshire	3	3	0	0	8	152	5
New Jersey	141	101	13	27	494	1,320	327
New Mexico	96	47	38	11	85	235	13
New York	705	627	18	60	2,573	8,849	1,426
North Carolina	716	703	3	10	1,371	6,261	1,639
North Dakota	269	67	201	1	448	140	98
Ohio	1,179	660	504	15	3,332	1,707	270
Oklahoma	128	99	26	3	1,240	485	75
Oregon	194	94	92	8	475	333	24
Pennsylvania	269	250	3	16	569	2,387	333
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	229	164	0	65	645	1,793	350

TABLE 93
(Continued)

	Number of Migrant Contacts[b]				Migrants Employed		
State	Total	Crew Leaders	Family Heads	Other	Families	Single Males	Single Females
South Dakota	13	4	9	0	53	19	0
Tennessee	81	60	8	13	130	395	178
Texas	1,905	1,032	831	42	4,642	3,884	378
Utah	95	68	26	1	248	260	17
Vermont	2	2	0	0	3	43	1
Virginia	1,090	870	165	55	2,350	5,700	1,350
Washington	262	153	94	15	458	1,091	77
West Virginia	25	25	0	0	60	333	9
Wisconsin	1,017	468	477	72	2,025	2,566	249
Wyoming	242	118	124	0	442	104	4

---

a. *The Annual Worker Plan in 1960*, U. S. Dept. of Labor.
b. Migrant contacts represent a count of all interviews recorded on Form ES-369, Migratory Labor Employment Record.

Source: Information in these tables is limited to data accumulated from Form ES-369, Migratory Labor Employment Record, by State Employment Security agencies in connection with the Annual Worker Plan.

The state employment department reports that there was considerable change in Colorado's participation in the Annual Worker Plan in 1961: "Many groups were contacted and recorded under the Annual Worker Plan who had not been previously scheduled. The number of workers served in the groups was 29 per cent greater than in 1960..."[3]

According to the director of the state employment department, a new system was established in 1961 in an effort to expedite recruitment under the Annual Worker Plan. With the cooperation of the Texas Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security, arrangements were made for crew leaders and recruiters to meet in several central locations in Texas. While this approach had merit, it was not as successful as had been anticipated, because less than half of the crew leaders who had been expected showed up at the scheduled meetings.[4]

During the migrant field interviews in 1961 and 1962, only two workers were found who were participating in the Annual Worker Plan. It was likely, however, that other workers interviewed were participating in the plan without knowing it, since employment arrangements had been made by their crew leaders.

---

[3] *Farm Labor Report 1961*, Colorado Department of Employment, Farm Placement Service, p. 38.

[4] Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of March 16, 1962.

Characteristics of the Seasonal Farm Labor Market

Although there are considerable variations in the organization of the seasonal farm labor market among the states and within areas of states as well,[5] there are several common characteristics applicable to all states and areas, and these characteristics in many ways differentiate the farm labor market from the industrial labor market.

The seasonal farm labor market is generally characterized by the following:

1) General Lack of Formal Relationships Between Growers and Workers. There are very few laws and no contractual agreements (with the exception of foreign workers) affecting the grower-worker relationship. Consequently, no grower has a hold on any worker, and no worker has a claim on any job. In other words, no grower can be certain that his domestic workers will show up for work the following day, and no worker can be certain that he will have work tomorrow just because he was employed today.

2) Casual Nature of Seasonal Farm Employment and the Low Level of Skills Required. The casual nature of seasonal farm employment and the low level of skills required for most farm labor tasks means that the worker's mobility is usually limited to seeking similar employment with another grower. There is very little possibility of a worker achieving a higher level job, either with his present employer or with another grower. The casual nature of seasonal farm employment also results generally in a lack of personal relationships between growers and workers. This lack of personal relationship is intensified by two factors: a) The grower often deals with a middle man between him and the worker. This middle man may be a crew leader, contractor, or a processing company field man. b) Labor recruitment is usually performed by someone besides the grower.

3) Multiple Sources of Labor Recruitment. The recruitment of seasonal farm labor involves state employment departments, growers' associations, processors, labor contractors, and occasionally individual growers. In those instances where there are formalized relationships among some of those involved in the recruitment process, these relationships apply usually to only a portion of the workers recruited in a given area.

4) Lack of Central Control Over Labor Recruitment, Utilization, and Reallocation. The lack of any central control over labor recruitment, utilization, and reallocation is illustrated by the following: a) the many different groups and individuals involved in the recruitment process, often at cross purposes; b) the lack of follow through or concern in the reassignment of workers once the job is completed for which original recruitment was made and the consequent lack of information on the part of the workers as to where further employment is available; c) the necessity usually of contacting workers individually or in relatively small crews rather than in large, cohesive, organized groups; and 4) the role tradition and past experience play in the movement of seasonal farm labor, especially in the absence of specific labor market information.

---

[5] The differences among areas in Colorado can be seen in the previous chapters of this report.

5) Lack of Relationship Between Wage Levels and the Supply of Workers Available, Limitations Upon Individual Growers in Making Wage Rate Determinations, and Workers' Inability to Influence Wage Rates. There is very little, if any, relationship between the wage rates established at the beginning of a growing season and estimates as to the number of seasonal domestic workers who will be attracted into the area. As observed during the field study, wage rates are determined in part by tradition, profit or loss during the past growing season, and current year's expectations. These rates are also influenced to a considerable extent by the rate established for Mexican nationals, except in those areas where seasonal farm labor is traditionally performed by domestic workers.[6]

The rates established by the United States Department of Agriculture also have a bearing on the rates set for other seasonal crop activities, as does the contractual agreements between processors and growers. In those areas, where there is an active growers' association, wage rates determined by this organization usually establish a pattern which is not deviated from in the area, even by growers who are not members. The lack of relationship between labor supply and wage rates exists even though some studies have shown that in the long run workers will be attracted to higher wage areas.[7] The availability of Mexican nationals, should a shortage of domestic workers be certified, may be one reason why concern over labor supply has not been translated to wage rate determinations.

All of the factors enumerated above severely limit decision making on wage rates by the individual grower. The workers, other than seeking employment elsewhere (in which event they would either be replaced by other domestic workers or braceros), have no course of action if they are dissatisfied over the wage rates offered. This is nowhere more apparent than in the home states of most domestic migrants where there is a large supply of labor, and the low wages offered cause many of them to join the migrant stream. Both the unskilled nature of the employment in which they are engaged and the lack of any effective organization make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for domestic workers to influence wage rates.

6) Low Population Density in Relation to Manpower Needs. The need for labor, especially in peak periods during the growing season, usually far exceeds the number of local seasonal workers available. This lack of a local labor supply has made the importation of large numbers of workers by whatever means possible absolutely necessary.

It should be noted that in states and areas where there has been a high degree of mechanization, the farm labor market has been altered considerably. Fewer workers are needed, and these workers are required to have higher skills than farm laborers working in stoop crop labor. Workers employed as adjuncts to mechanized agricultural operations receive higher wages, and these wages are usually paid on an hourly rather than a piece basis. The need for a greater degree of skill and the possible dangers of working with machinery has substantially reduced, and in many instances has eliminated, the number of women and children employed as farm laborers.

---

[6] For a more complete discussion of the relationship between wage rates for Mexican nationals and domestic workers, see the chapter on the Arkansas Valley in this report.

[7] The Seasonal Agricultural Labor Market In Colorado, John Gore, Doctor's Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1962., p. 37.

Legislation, Regulations, and Governmental Actions Affecting the Farm Labor Market in Colorado

The industrial labor market is affected to a considerable extent by federal and state legislation and related rules and regulations. Some of the subjects covered by this legislation include: workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, minimum wages, child labor, overtime, labor relations, social security, and safety standards. Application of legislation (both state and federal) on these subjects usually extends to farm labor in a lesser degree, if at all, in most states.[8]

Seasonal farm employment in Colorado is affected by the following federal laws and regulations:

1) inclusion of some workers under social security (those who work 20 days for or earn $150 from one employer);

2) minimum age of 16 years for employment during school hours (Fair Labor Standards Act);

3) minimum age of 14 years for employment in sugar beet work (Sugar Act);

4) wage determination hearings and orders for sugar beet work (Sugar Act);

5) transportation standards for workers traveling by truck in interstate commerce (Interstate Commerce Commission regulations);

6) employment of Mexican nationals and related wage rate determinations (Public Law 78 and amendments thereto); and

7) regulations concerning the housing and employment of interstate labor (U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security).

State legislation covering agricultural workers in Colorado is limited to the following:

1) provision that labor contractors and crew leaders employing migrant farm workers must keep detailed payroll records and submit copies of same to the Industrial Commission and must give each worker in their employ a written statement of earnings and deductions;[9] and

2) recourse to the Industrial Commission's wage claim authority if wages are illegally withheld or only partially paid.[10]

---

[8] See separate chapter in this report on legislation in other states.

[9] Chapter 80, Article 25, Colorado Revised Statutes 1953, 1960 Permanent Supplement.

[10] *Ibid*.

Colorado statutes relating to minimum wage and hours of work for women and children appear to be sufficiently broad to apply to their employment as seasonal farm workers but have never been so interpreted or utilized. Section 80-9-3, Colorado Revised Statutes 1953, in part provides the following:

> It shall be unlawful to employ women in any occupation within the state of Colorado for wages which are inadequate to supply the necessary cost of living, and to maintain in health the women so employed. It shall be unlawful to employ minors in any occupation within the state of Colorado for unreasonably low wages...

In addition, the operations and regulations of the state employment department's farm placement service in conjunction with the U. S. Bureau of Employment Security has a substantial impact on the farm labor market.

State Department of Employment

The fragmented nature of the seasonal farm labor market indicates that it is unlikely that the market could ever be effectively structured and organized, except by a public agency--even then, it is doubtful. The state agency which plays the biggest role in the organization of the farm labor market is the department of employment's farm placement service. The present program dates from the return of farm placement service functions to the U. S. Department of Labor and the respective state employment departments in 1948.

Employment Department Relationship With U. S. Bureau of Employment Security

The federal government finances the activities of state employment departments, including the farm placement service. Departmental budget appropriations are based on departmental activities. Each state employment department must report to the bureau monthly on the amount of time its employees spend on various activities. The number of job placements have a direct bearing on the amount of money appropriated. The monthly reports are carefully reviewed and audited by the Bureau of Employment Security.[11]

The bureau also provides the state departments with technical assistance. Such assistance may be requested in the evaluation of existing programs and in the development of new programs. The federal legislative basis for the relationship between the state and federal agencies is contained in the Wagner-Peyser Act and the amendments thereto.[12]

---

11. Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of January 18, 1962.
12. Ibid.

The Denver regional office of the Bureau of Employment Security covers a five-state area: Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. As is the case with other employment security functions, the farm placement service is a joint effort of the state and federal governments; however, the operation of this program within each state is the state's responsibility.[13]

Farm Placement Division

The farm placement division is an administrative unit of the state department of employment, with a supervisor and three assistants on the state level. This service works with local area employment offices through the four employment department field supervisors. These field supervisors are responsible for all of the local area offices' functions, not just those relating to farm labor. In some local offices, there may be staff members assigned only to farm labor, and, in a few areas, separate farm labor offices are maintained during the growing season. The farm placement division is "responsible for developing, coordinating, supervising and/or executing plans for the recruitment, mobilization, direction, and utilization of local, intrastate, and interstate farm labor."[14]

Governor's Farm Labor Advisory Council. The division is assisted and advised by the Governor's Farm Labor Advisory Council. This council is composed of 13 members, and all except one represent growers, shippers, and processors. For the first time, an officer of the Colorado A.F.L.--C.I.O. was added to the council in 1962. The council holds regular annual meetings, at which time problems relating to the recruitment and efficient use of agricultural labor are discussed and possible solutions suggested. Pending legislation and regulations relating to farm labor are also reviewed by the council. Special meetings are called by the chairman, when further discussion and review of problems and legislation are indicated.

Functions of the Farm Placement Division

The farm placement division is directly involved in: 1) the recruitment of domestic farm labor; 2) the referral and reallocation of such labor, including day-haul activities and the organization of field crews in some areas; 3) the determination of labor needs; 4) the certification of domestic worker shortages requiring the importation of Mexican nationals; 5) the inspection of migrant housing, with the corresponding responsibility of withholding domestic labor from growers who do not comply with the housing regulations and/or correction of housing deficiencies when informed of same; and 6) cooperation with other states in the recruitment and referral of labor and in the operation of the Annual Worker Plan.

---

[13] Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of January 18, 1962.

[14] Farm Labor Report 1961, op. cit., p. 3.

March 16, 1962 Meeting With Employment Department

The Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor requested a meeting with departmental officials on March 16, 1962 to obtain a better understanding of the employment department's farm labor service operations. At that time, the committee directed questions covering several topics on farm labor service operations to the department and farm placement division officials present. The committee also requested similar information from employment departments in selected states. Following is a summary by topic of the discussion with the Colorado Department of Employment; also included is explanatory material, as well as information received from other state employment departments.

Comprehensive Farm Labor Requirement Plan

1) Does the department make independent statistical estimates of acreage, average productivity, and timing of agricultural activities in order to arrive at the maximum number of workers needed independently of the worker requests made by growers?

Explanation. An adequate farm labor utilization plan should include acreage and production data by area and crop (or perhaps even by sub-area as in California), manpower needed, and worker productivity by area and crop. Once a basic plan is developed, annual revision can be made according to acreage and productivity changes and the effect of mechanical and technological improvement. Such a plan, among other things, provides the basis: 1) for determining the validity of labor requests; 2) for determining recruitment needs by origin of workers (intrastate, local, and interstate); 3) for determining the accuracy of seasonal farm worker weekly census reports; 4) for expediting the reallocation of workers during the growing and harvest seasons; and 5) improving the possibility of eliminating temporary labor shortages and surpluses.

Employment Department. The farm placement division has explained the procedure for determining labor needs as follows:[15]

> The determination of reasonably accurate estimates of the farm labor supply and demand is dependent upon gathering data from many sources. Employment data reported on...
>
> Weekly In-Season Farm Labor Reports, are key punched on IBM cards. At the end of the reporting season, these data are tabulated by agricultural reporting area, by local office, by crop activity, and by week. Crop acreage estimates for the coming year are assembled by the local offices in February and submitted to the Research and Analyses Section in the Central Office. Estimates of the number of local workers expected to be available

---

[15] Farm Labor Report 1961, op. cit., pp. 44-45.

during the coming season are also submitted by the local offices. Colorado Department of Employment's recruiters in neighboring states report on the number of interstate farm workers expected to be shipped during the coming season. These data are then used as the basis for estimating labor demand and supply for the coming year. Adjustments are made in light of current information; e.g., the portion of a crop expected to be harvested by machine or changes in the amount of work accomplished by an average worker. Labor shortage estimates are then projected by week for the coming season.

At the March 16, 1962 meeting, the director of employment said that if the Colorado employment department had a large appropriation, he would not hesitate to prepare an elaborate labor requirement plan such as California's; however, under existing budgetary limitations it would be difficult to justify.[16] The reliance of the department on the weekly farm labor reports as a basis for estimating labor needs was questioned, because the field study indicated that in some areas and for some types of workers, these estimates were inaccurate. The director of employment felt that the weekly reports were as accurate as could be obtained without making an actual worker count, which is impossible.

Other States. Four of the 11 states answering the committee questionnaire have developed comprehensive acreage, productivity, and manpower schedules. Maryland developed such a schedule a number of years ago and revises it annually on the basis of local office reports. Michigan developed and put into effect a new farm labor requirement plan in 1960. In the development of this plan field surveys were conducted covering various activities in each of the agricultural reporting areas. These surveys included: county of employment, number of workers, beginning and termination of employment, labor force composition, productivity, work days by crop activity, and origin of workers (local, intrastate, or interstate). From these surveys average worker productivity bench marks were compiled. By coordinating the acreage and productivity figures of the 1959 census and the U. S. Department of Agriculture estimates on commercial farms by county, total man day labor requirements were determined. These requirements were checked further against job orders and placement reports. For agricultural activities for which all labor is recruited by processors and associations, acreage and tree information was submitted by them on a semi-monthly basis together with the number of workers employed. This information was used as a further check. Once the basic survey has been made, further surveys are not needed on an annual basis except in crop activities or areas where the composition of the work force changes or mechanical and scientific developments change work force requirements.

---

[16] Unless otherwise indicated, the employment department information under each question was taken from the remarks of the director of employment and other department staff members at the March 16, 1962 meeting.

Virginia has used a general farm labor requirement plan since 1947. The basis of this plan is the contact of growers for information on proposed acreages, types of crops, numbers of workers needed, and periods of need. Contacts are made throughout the year in order to keep the requirement estimate current. Revision of the general plan is unnecessary, but revision of the detail on contacts is constant. Contacts also vary in different crop areas and seasons.

A comprehensive farm labor requirement plan is developed annually for the state of Oregon as a whole. The basis for this plan is an early pre-season determination of the approximate acreage of each significant labor-using crop in each local office area within designated agricultural reporting areas. This determination is based largely on a field visiting program supplemented with or guided by lists of growers and acreages obtained from processors, shippers, growers' associations, irrigation districts, soil conservation districts, county agents, or other governmental agencies. Insofar as possible at the early annual date, acreages for the coming season are verified by direct field visiting if furnished originally by some other source. Less significantly, labor using crops are lumped together under the heading "All Other Agricultural Activities," and a determination is made as to the total acreage in the local office area which is involved in these activities, which individually employ less than 100 seasonal workers at the peak of the activity in the area.

Labor demands are then computed by the local office for the total acreage involved in each crop activity in the area for each half-month period in the season. This computation is based on previous experience as to labor demand for the activity per acre, taking into account the effect of increased mechanization, crop condition, or any other factors then possible to assess.

An estimate is then made of the probable amount of labor available for each activity and each period, from local, intrastate, and interstate sources, based again on past experience, employment and economic trends in these sources, and any other foreseeable variables. Possible shortages are calculated for each period and activity where the expected demand exceeds the supply. Additional data is assembled by reporting offices regarding the numbers of orders received for agricultural labor, openings filled, and openings cancelled, the number and capacity of housing units, both on and off the farm, available in the area for seasonal workers for each crop activity and in total, and the number of trailer hook-ups available, likewise by activity and in total.

By April 1 of each year, the agricultural local office submits a report to the state administrative office covering the above mentioned data and requirements, probable supply and anticipated shortages for each crop activity, and totals for all activities for each reporting period, together with a narrative plan of action describing methods to be used and personnel to be assigned in conducting recruitment and field visiting, taking and filling employers' orders, organizing and supervising day-haul activities, promoting and maintaining public relations, gathering labor market information, operating seasonal offices, and obtaining data for required in-season reports.

Local office pre-season reports are summarized by the Research and Statistics Division of the Oregon agency to provide the total pre-season picture for the state. Narrative plans of action are carefully reviewed, in some cases discussed and revised, and statewide plans are made to fill, insofar as possible, the needs foreseen.

Five states (Delaware, Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio, and Washington) appear to depend largely on the previous year's acreage and number of workers reported, as modified by local office early season estimates of acreage and labor needs. Three of these states (Minnesota, Ohio, and Washington) indicate that the central office reviews these local office estimates quite carefully and checks them against other information sources.

2) Are labor requests checked, in what way and on what basis? Does the department ever reduce the number of workers requested?

Explanation. A basic labor requirement plan makes it possible to check the validity of labor requests more accurately. This question does not imply that growers, associations, or processors purposely request an oversupply of labor. Such requests are more than likely the exception rather than the rule. However, without productivity and acreage information, how can a determination be made as to whether requests are high or low? To a certain extent, past experience provides a guide, and any significant change in the number of workers requested should at least be questioned by the department.

Employment Department. As a general rule, the department approves the number of workers requested by growers and processors. There is always a shortage of domestic workers, so it is necessary to certify Mexican nationals. It is costly to bring in braceros, and this factor acts as a control on worker requests.

Other States. Other states were asked whether they required supporting data on labor requests and whether they checked requests and ever reduced the number of workers requested. Delaware and Illinois report that no supporting data is required because needs have been fairly well determined by experience. Illinois, however, will refuse requests if minimum standards are not met regarding wages, working conditions, and housing.

Several states require supporting information. In Michigan, requests must be supported by acreage or tree information. A three-year average is used to determine average productivity per worker. If the labor request exceeds the department's calculated manpower need, discussions are held with the employer to determine the reason. In addition to data on acreage, Minnesota requires information on mechanization and any other factors affecting labor needs and reports that labor requests have not been inflated. Maryland, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington report that requests are reviewed carefully by both local offices and the central office. Maryland mentioned specifically that requests are checked against the department's acreage and crop surveys. Most of these states also require that housing, wages, etc., meet minimum standards.

The practices described above obtain regardless of whether requests are made by individual growers, processors, or growers' associations. Pennsylvania requires associations to list individual grower members and the labor needs of each. This information is then checked against acreage and productivity data on a farm-by-farm basis.

Utilization of Local Labor

1) To what extent is effort made to make full utilization of local labor? Are there specific programs for this purpose? If so, what are they and how effective? For example, to what extent are day-hauls used? What is the longest one-way distance for day-hauls? What is the average one-way distance for day-hauls? What per cent of total labor needs are supplied by the day-haul program?

2) Does the placement service have a high school program or some other type of youth program designed to encourage older youngsters to work as seasonal farm workers during the summer months? Is every effort made to make full use of local labor before outside workers are recruited?

Explanation. Although this study is focused on migratory labor, all components of the seasonal farm labor market need consideration to present a balanced picture. In certain areas and at certain times during the growing season, there is definitely an inadequate supply of local workers. In other areas, this has appeared to be the case, but no specific employment department program aimed at the employment of local workers as seasonal farm workers was observed.

Employment Department. Every effort is made to assure full use of local labor. Three approaches to the utilization of local labor were then discussed. These included youth programs, day-hauls, and extensive selective recruiting in urban areas.

The director of employment said that he disagreed with federal officials on the utility of youth programs. All young people throughout the state are encouraged to take summer farm employment, but the department has not conducted any intensive recruiting in the high schools. There are several shortcomings in any youth program. First, there evidently is little interest among city youths to work on farms, or there would be more requests for farm employment. Second, city youths are untrained for farm work and are not used to the hard physical labor often demanded. Third, youths who have been working during the summer have to leave the farm to return to school in September. In the Greeley area, for example, there is still a great need for labor during the first part of September for potato harvest.

A youth program had been successful in the Greeley area in 1961 because the program had been approached with a reasonable view, and the young workers had been employed in such tasks as tractor driving. The department would not intensify its youth recruitment program in 1962, but all youths who showed an interest would be encouraged. Two additional reasons for the success of the Greeley youth program were cited. First, there was considerable community interest and support for this project. Second, most of the youngsters involved were originally from farm families who had moved to Greeley, and they were experienced in farm work and welcomed the opportunity to obtain this kind of summer employment.

The number of day-hauls and day-haul points have been reduced in recent years because of: 1) a decrease in the number of workers available; and 2) technological changes affecting labor requirements. There were only 40 workers available on a daily basis in Denver for day-hauls in 1961 as compared with as many as 300 in previous years. These workers must be screened carefully to avoid alcoholics. The minimum use of day-hauls in the Arkansas Valley had been successful in 1961, and it was hoped that the program could be expanded. No need for day-hauls in the San Luis Valley had as yet been demonstrated. The decrease in the number of day-hauls in the Fort Lupton area was a direct result of the mechanization of the green bean harvest.

Public housing projects were mentioned as a possible source of obtaining agricultural workers in the Denver area. The department had tried this approach and had not found it to be successful. Not all urban workers will accept farm employment, even if they have a farm background and are otherwise unemployed. This situation makes urban recruiting difficult, especially when compounded by the problem of alcoholism.

Other States. Delaware reports that only a limited supply of local labor is available. There is no youth program, and day-hauls have met with only limited success. An extensive program is underway this year to recruit local workers on a full-time, permanent basis. Idaho had an increase in 1961 of 28 per cent over 1960 in the number of local workers employed. (Local workers accounted for 53 per cent of the total seasonal farm labor force.) Mechanization was partially responsible for this increase, because growers tended to hire local people to operate mechanical cultivation and harvest equipment. There were 19 day-haul points located in 11 small communities. There were also 10 day-hauls operated for high school youth.

Illinois reports that several approaches to the recruitment of local workers are employed. Day-hauls are used in many places throughout the state. During the past season there were 31 supervised and 98 unsupervised day-haul programs in operation. The first was in 21 towns, average workers transported 1,433; the latter was in 61 towns with average workers transported 2,475. The average day-haul is about ten miles one way. The school program consists of signing up high school/youths for corn de-tasseling. Day-hauls from Chicago proper have never been satisfactory. In Maryland, some one-way day-hauls were as far as 100 to 150 miles in 1961. Continuous effort is made to organize day-hauls and local worker pools throughout the state.

Michigan states that day-hauls have not been too effective. Some farmers would arrive early and pick up more workers than could be given a full day's work. Also the constant shuffling of workers among employers provided no opportunity for good employee-worker relationships. Three years ago, some of the techniques of the annual worker plan were applied to the scheduling of local labor with some success. High schools are contacted early in the spring and interested youths registered. Transportation arrangements are also made in advance of the growing season. Farmers are contacted and those interested in using high school youths have specific youngsters assigned to them.

In 1961, Minnesota made a concentrated statewide effort to place local youths in sugar beet thinning and hoeing. This program was considered successful and will be expanded this year. A special effort will also be made this year to promote more employment of locals, especially youth, in vegetable crops. Fifty-seven regular day-hauls were operated from 49 communities in 1961, and there were 55 youth day-hauls.

Ohio attempts to recruit former migrant workers who have settled in the state; usually at least some family members are available. Day-haul programs have been quite successful; in 1961, there were 106 day-haul points in 53 communities. During the peak harvest period, day-hauls provided 5,033 of the 12,000 workers employed. (It should be remembered that Ohio has many large urban communities.) Day-hauls are usually limited to one-way drives of an hour or less. High school youth are employed but are limited in availability for harvest work because of school sessions.

Specific programs are provided to make full utilization of local labor in Oregon. Day-hauls are used very extensively. In 1961 there were 48 organized day-haul points in 22 communities.

It is estimated that well over one-third of all workers in the two heaviest labor-using activities (strawberries and beans) are transported by day-hauls. To a lesser degree and for a smaller percentage of the total workers, day-hauls bring workers to the fields for other crops throughout the season.

The average one-way distance for day-hauls is probably 10 to 15 miles. Again, no exact figures are available. Some day-hauls were operated for a short period in 1960 and 1961 in which the one-way distance was 80 miles or slightly over. Several have operated for years involving a one-way distance of 40 to 50 miles.

The youth program in Oregon includes both high schools and upper grade schools. Thousands of young workers are recruited and employed each year in the strawberry, cranberry, and bean harvests. Recruitment is arranged for and conducted in the schools by local office farm placement personnel. Three recruitment and training films for strawberry and bean pickers have been produced by the Visual Educational Department of Oregon State University, extension service, and employment department. These have been shown extensively for the past several years at school assemblies and to individual classes. Showings are accompanied with personal appearances by the local office representative to explain job opportunities, the need for workers, and how students can register for work. Sometimes growers or platoon leaders accompany the local office representative to answer questions, give further explanation, and help recruit workers and organize day-hauls or platoons. Where films have been used for several years, appearances only, or showing of a film annually to the sixth grade only have been successful. Registration cards, with space provided for entering name, age, sex, address, telephone number, preferred crop activities and grower choice, if any, are used for self-registration of students interested in summer jobs. Some offices use a larger registration form for older high school youths who have experience, skills, and/or physical qualifications for certain types of jobs. Other offices use the regular registration card for this purpose, with entries briefed to significant items.

Full utilization of local labor is attempted in Virginia; however, the implementation of specific programs varies widely. These programs include day-haul, high school placement programs, and newspaper, TV and radio advertising. Implementation of these programs depends upon the crop involved, the type and availability of local labor, the season and the geography involved. There is only one area in Virginia that has been successful in day-haul operations. This is the area surrounding Norfolk. Here the crop activity is strawberry picking. This requires little skill and does not entail heavy labor. The terrain is comparatively level and does not create transportation problems. The Norfolk metropolitan area abounds with available housewives, semi-retired and others not normally in the labor force.

The day-haul program is considered to be a prime tool in Washington in the full utilization of local labor. The day-haul program has proven to be exceedingly effective when controlled properly by the Employment Security Department. Controls include the issuance of radio and newspaper publicity in order to alert workers of the need and the physical control of the workers at agency-supervised pick-up points. Perhaps the longest one-way, day-haul distance is 30 miles with the average one-way distance being approximately 15 to 20 miles. The percentage of total labor needs supplied through the use of the day-haul program varies from area to area and ranges from more than 90 per cent in the King County bean harvest to less than five per cent in the Eastern Washington apple harvest. The Western Washington strawberry harvest is probably a good example of the average; approximately 75 per cent of the workers are supplied through day-haul.

There were 37 day-haul pick-up points in 19 cities and towns operated for the purpose of utilizing local workers. As many as 2,800 workers were transported each day from these pick-up points. Eighteen day-haul pick-up points were established by the department for the purpose of utilizing the services of school age youth. In addition, farm employers are encouraged to employ youth on live-in jobs. It is a regular practice for local office personnel to appear before high school assemblies to encourage student participation in summertime farm activities.

> Closely related to topics covering the determination of labor requirements, labor requests, and the utilization of local labor is the question as to what happens when the determination is made that the estimated labor supply (including labor from all sources) does not equal the demand? Part of this question is when and how is this determination made?

Explanation. This question was asked to find out whether an estimated shortage is met automatically by certification of the need for braceros or whether recruitment efforts are intensified on all levels. Timing is extremely important, because a late season expected shortage might well require the use of Mexican nationals, because most domestic workers would already be assigned. If anticipated early season (pre-harvest) shortages are estimated in February and March or even in April, there might be sufficient time for additional recruitment efforts before a shortage is certified.

In most of the states responding to the committee's questionnaire, the number of foreign workers employed has decreased steadily in recent years. Wage scales and travel distance are among the reasons for this decrease, but so apparently is more intensified recruiting. The decline in the number of foreign workers employed in Eastern Seaboard states can be explained largely by the availability of Puerto Ricans (not only from the island but also locally as they continue to settle on the mainland in increasing numbers).

In Colorado the number of braceros employed at the peak period has remained fairly constant during the past four years, according to U. S. Bureau of Employment Security figures.[17] They are being used to a greater extent in a number of crops, however.

Employment Department. Generally the department follows the practice of other states in not certifying the need for Mexican nationals until 15 days before the crop activity in which they are to be used is scheduled to begin. Labor needs are re-evaluated constantly throughout the growing season and efforts are made to find available domestic labor, but this is not usually successful.

Other States. When demand exceeds estimated supply, the Eastern Seaboard states (Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia) first step up recruitment of locals (although in Delaware this does not produce many additional workers). Secondly, contact is made among other seaboard states to locate workers; this is followed by bringing in Puerto Ricans. In Virginia, foreign workers (Bahamians) have been used only during the peak of the apple harvest.

Michigan differentiates between temporary shortages (one to three weeks' duration) and those likely to exist for a longer period. With respect to the former, local recruitment is stepped up and an effort is made to get workers to put in extra hours. The use of newspaper and radio appeals sometimes has an adverse effect because crews and solo workers may leave current employers to come to the shortage areas. It is difficult to find locals by this process who will remain until the end of the crop activity. Most interested and reliable locals have already made firm employment arrangements. If a shortage of more than three weeks is anticipated, other states are contacted to locate additional labor before foreign workers are recommended. This approach is also followed generally by Illinois, which also examines the employers' own efforts to recruit domestic labor before determining the need for foreign or offshore workers. Foreign workers in Michigan accounted for nine per cent of the total labor force requirement in 1961. However,

---

17. Legislative Council Committee on Migrant Labor, Minutes of Meeting of January 18, 1962.

these 15,000 workers were primarily concentrated in two crops: sugar beet blocking and thinning (25 per cent of total labor force) and cucumber harvest (70 per cent of total labor force). In Illinois there were 425 foreign workers employed in 1960, and only 95 in 1961. Pennsylvania has not used any foreign workers for years, but employs about 1,100 Puerto Ricans annually.

Minnesota steps up local labor recruitment activities and then explores additional states of supply before foreign workers are brought in. Ohio sends recruiters to areas where crop activities are being completed in an effort to get additional workers. In Ohio no foreign workers were used in 1961, and the department reports that they are seldom needed in that state. If it becomes apparent sometime before harvest that normal recruiting methods will not provide sufficient labor, certification will be requested 30 days before the need occurs. In 1961, only 55 Mexican nationals and 133 Bahamians were needed to supplement Minnesota's seasonal farm labor force.

If the demand for labor exceeds the supply in Oregon, recruitment activities for local, intrastate, and interstate workers are continued and intensified. Special newspaper, radio, and television publicity, proclamations by the governor or mayors of cities in demand areas, and sound car announcements are used to urge housewives, business people, other employed persons, and anyone else available to turn out during days or hours off to help save the crop. In a few cases whole towns have shut down or greatly reduced business for a day or half day so workers could help out temporarily with the harvest. If the demand is expected to continue and housing is available, this is made known throughout the state through the usual news media, and clearance orders are kept open with continued efforts to recruit. Both within the state and in adjacent states, attempt is made to locate migratory workers uncommitted for the period of need and to refer them to the area of need. When available housing is full or the demand is only for a short peak period, all that can be done is to intensify local and nearby recruitment efforts. In only one area in the state has it been necessary each year to certify a labor shortage and bring in Mexican nationals in recent years, in spite of increased efforts to recruit local workers and to bring in intrastate and interstate workers through the Annual Worker Plan. This area is relatively remote from heavier population centers and the demand comes at a time when employment in agriculture is still high in other parts of the states, with many migratory workers already returned to their homes to enter their children in school. Certification also appeared necessary for two other areas in recent years, but it was possible for the last several years to recruit enough help finally to avoid bringing in braceros for these two areas. The number of Mexican nationals employed in Oregon in 1961 was 327, and in 1960, 349. More Mexican nationals were used in 1956 than in any year since, the number in this year being 958.

Because Washington is located a great distance from the southern border of the United States, the department has been able to convince most Washington employers that the use of foreign or offshore workers is far too expensive except under long-term contracts. Further recruitment efforts to attract local and intrastate workers accomplished through the use of a clearance system of job offers and through increased efforts on the part of the department's network of mobile seasonal agricultural offices. It is not unusual for employers to provide free one-way transportation for workers from distances up to 275 miles.

Utilization of Intrastate Workers

1) To what extent does the department recruit intrastate workers or encourage these workers to take employment in other parts of the state, other than ordinary job referrals?

Explanation. Intrastate workers are an important component of the seasonal farm labor force. The recruitment and allocation of intrastate workers usually is the next step in meeting labor needs after the number of available local workers is determined. Experience over the years provides the basis for forecasting how many of these workers are available, but such forecasting should be related to past methods and areas of recruitment.

It appears that some Colorado workers become employed in other areas of the state because of low wage rates or insufficient employment opportunities, at least in their view, in their home areas. A considerable number of intrastate workers were found in the Palisade area during peach harvest and also in the San Luis Valley during potato harvest (although most of these come to Rio Grande and Saguache counties from the southern part of the valley). Only a few intrastate workers were found during the field study in Northern Colorado.

Employment Department. The department makes every effort to refer to other parts of the state Colorado residents who are not employed or who do not wish to be employed in their home areas. These efforts are not always successful. Sometimes when intrastate workers are referred, they either do not go to the area to which referred or do not accept the employment for which referred.

Other States. Delaware and Virginia have difficulty getting locat workers to take employment in other parts of the state. In Delaware they are not available, because of the limited number of local workers. Michigan contacts group leaders of intrastate workers during the winter and early spring months and work schedules are arranged in the same manner as for interstate migrants under the annual worker plan. Those contacted are also encouraged to provide the department with the names and addresses of other group leaders who think they may desire to work on seasonal farm jobs. These are then contacted for confirmation and tentative commitments.

Past efforts to recruit intrastate workers for sugar beet blocking and thinning in Oregon in years of relatively high unemployment have been almost completely unsuccessful. Intrastate workers in small numbers reported and tried, but very few lasted more than a few hours at the continuous stoop-labor job. Better success has been attained in recruiting workers within the state for pea harvest and also for pear and apple harvest. Because of limited housing facilities and because of the need to keep the influx of workers somewhat in proportion to the growth of demand, so that workers will not arrive too soon, become discouraged, and then leave before demand becomes serious, a state-office-controlled quota system has been used with some success. Clearance orders, accompanied with suitable publicity, are transmitted somewhat ahead of the beginning of the season to be activated later, so that local offices can inform claimants, other suitable registered applicants, and walk-ins of the coming job opportunities and build up a pre-selected list of applicants who have expressed interest in the job.

As the season gets under way and demand exceeds supply, the clearance order is activated, but only for a limited number of workers, according to actual need, as reported daily to the administrative office. The total number ordered daily is broken up there into a quota for each local office that has reported having interested applicants available, and these offices are notified by telephone as to the number they are to refer with instructions to report in the next few days. This method has been of help in slowing down the rush of single male workers to the areas where these activities occur before they can be absorbed and has served to get them to work.

Through the use of intrastate clearance orders, and through the activity of local and mobile seasonal agricultural offices, intrastate workers are recruited for jobs in other parts of Washington. For example, many crews, groups, and families who normally are residents of eastern Washington communities are recruited for berry, cucumber, cauliflower, and broccoli harvests in western Washington. Prearranged schedules of these workers, however, are never interrupted by this agency even though the workers are scheduled for a job outside the state of Washington. Many of these crews, groups, and families who are residents also are part of the Annual Worker Plan and as such have been committed to jobs in Washington and other western states more than 90 days prior to the date of need.

Allocation and/or Reallocation of Workers in a Given Area

1) What role does the farm placement service play in the allocation or reallocation of workers within given areas? Does the placement service's function in this respect extend to workers brought in by processors or growers' organizations or to workers brought in by the placement service but assigned to growers' organizations or processors? How do the farm placement service and growers, growers' organizations, and processors cooperate in the reallocation of labor?

2) To what extent are interstate migrants encouraged to work in other areas of the state as well before leaving? How successful have these efforts been? (For example, have growers or processors been contacted re the provision of transportation from one area of the state to another for workers willing to work in another area?

Explanation. A responsible coordinating agency is needed to embrace as much of the seasonal farm labor market as possible if a higher degree of organization is to be achieved. This agency should be the state department of employment, and, to make coordination successful, cooperation is necessary among growers, associations, and processors. This cooperation should go much further than initial labor requests and recruitment and occasional job referrals. One example of what can be accomplished can be seen in the efforts of the department and the peach control board. It is not important that the department by itself or in combination with assocations and processors recruit and assign all labor. It is important that the coordinating agency know where workers are and how they are employed, regardless of how they were obtained, and that a coordinated effort be made in the reallocation or scheduling of workers after the initial activity is completed. For example, to achieve desired results the department should not only participate in the reallocation program of Empire Field Crops, but provide leadership and direction.

A program aimed at recruiting interstate workers already in the state is very important in achieving maximum labor utilization. Fullest utilization of interstate labor is necessary for several reasons: First, the peak demands for labor which cannot be met locally make it necessary that full utilization be made of other available labor. Second, it is expensive and time consuming to recruit interstate labor, and many of these workers travel long distances to come to Colorado. It is inefficient to bring workers in for one activity and then lose them, so that the process has to be repeated over again. Third, full utilization of interstate labor is (or should be) important to the workers themselves. The wage data compiled from the migrant interviews showed that the earnings of these workers are reduced considerably because of long periods of non-work and travel.

The field study showed that in the Arkansas Valley, 48.5 per cent of the domestic migrants in the Rocky Ford-La Junta area leave by July 30, with a large number of these leaving between June 30 and July 10. Fifty per cent of the early season domestic migrants leave the Lamar area by July 30, and it is estimated that 28 per cent of these might be available for work in other areas. Approximately 250 early season workers in the Arkansas Valley might be available for work in other areas.

The migrant interviews in the San Luis Valley indicate that 18 per cent of the early season interstate workers in the San Luis Valley, exclusive of the Filipino lettuce pickers, leave by July 30, and an additional 10 per cent leave by August 30. In the Monte Vista area, 21 per cent of the early season workers (exclusive of Filipinos) leave by July 30, an additional three per cent leave by August 30.

It is estimated from the migrant questionnaire that possibly 21 per cent of the peach harvest workers might be available and interested in working elsewhere in Colorado following completion of the harvest. In arriving at this proportion, all workers who had even the slightest reason for not staying were excluded. The application of this proportion to the total interstate migrant force during peach harvest results in an estimate of 600 workers. Nine per cent of the interstate migrants interviewed planned to stay in the area until the completion of apple harvest. Another ten per cent indicated that they would work in other areas in the state before returning home. Some were going to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest, others (mostly Cherokee Indians) were going to Baca County for broomcorn harvest, and still others were going to pick apples in Hotchkiss.

In computing the 21 per cent availability estimate, no crews brought in by contractors were included. It is interesting to note, however, that a few crews from Louisiana planned to remain for apple harvest in both the Palisade and Hotchkiss areas. Possibly contractual arrangements covering apples were made at the same time as for peaches. If this is the case, it opens up new possibilities in the scheduling of workers. Perhaps more crews (especially since they travel long distances) might be willing to remain through apple harvest. Although a number of Cherokee Indians indicated that they would work during broomcorn harvest in Baca County, equally as many were going to return directly to Oklahoma or work in another state.

Most of the domestic workers in the Fort Morgan-Sterling area leave by the middle of July. The employment department attempts to recruit these workers for the Greeley and Fort Lupton areas, but has had limited success. The same is true with respect to early season workers around Loveland and Fort Collins. Those workers who leave Colorado, either return to Texas (most of them) or travel to midwestern states for further employment. The migrant interviews indicate that most of the early season workers in the Fort Lupton and Greeley area intended to remain throughout the season. Some Texas crews work in the San Luis Valley potato harvest after the potato harvest is completed in Weld County.

The employment department handles labor allocation in the Fort Lupton area, with excellent cooperation from growers and processors. This allocation program is centered around the Fort Luoton labor camp and applies chiefly to three crops, of which snap beans are the most important; the others are onions and potatoes. Growers and processors try to inform the department of labor needs as far in advance as possible and also provide information on the number of workers they have who are working, as well as those available for another assignment. An employment department staff member working with crew leaders, contractors, and processors' field men schedules the work to be performed and the assignment of workers.

Employment Department. The department does try to get interstate workers to accept other jobs in the area, or elsewhere in the state, but with varying degrees of success. Domestic workers have very definite work preferences and often won't accept other types of work. As an example, it is very difficult to get domestic workers to pick cucumbers, even though they may be unemployed in the particular crop activity which they prefer. At the time the workers are recruited, they are informed of job opportunities throughout the state and are encouraged to make commitments for some of these jobs, if they can be worked into their schedules. Many workers won't follow a plan once it has been set up, but seem to prefer to follow the whims of chance and trust to luck that they will find a job. It is only natural that the farmers and processors should try to avoid advancing transportation costs, even though it might encourage workers to go to another area of the state where they are needed. The supply of labor may diminish in the next few years, however, to the extent that growers and processors may have to advance much more in transportation costs for domestic workers than they do at present.

The labor allocation program in the Fort Lupton area has been quite successful. Much could possibly be accomplished along these lines in the Arkansas Valley. One of the complicating factors in the Arkansas Valley is the portion of the labor market controlled by contractors. The most important factor in the successful operation of labor allocation programs is gaining the confidence of growers and contractors.

Other States--Reallocation. Michigan reports its farm placement service makes every effort to reallocate workers within a given area. The growers' associations have used a scheduling process similar to the Annual Worker Plan for many years. It was developed to recruit and hold interstate labor within the state. If they are unable to fill in all gaps among their own members, the department is called in to provide additional work to maintain full employment. In these instances, the associations request that they be furnished with the names and locations of growers to whom this labor is supplied so that contact can be maintained to assure that these workers will be returned on schedule to the association. Growers' associations have cooperated with the department in making certain that foreign workers are not employed while domestic workers are idle.

Minnesota has been successful in allocating and reallocating workers within a large area and works with associations and processors in this respect.

The local offices in Oregon at all times, but especially when labor is in short supply, are alert to the possibility of utilizing fully the interstate workers in their areas. Growers are encouraged to exchange workers with neighbors, when not needed by the grower who has them, and to call the local office whenever workers will be available for work elsewhere for a day or more -- even a half day at times. Large and small groups of workers are shifted around the area, helping greatly to avoid crop loss or catching up on urgent work -- thus utilizing both workers and housing to better advantage. Many growers will permit workers to stay in their housing and work for others after completing or catching up on work where they are housed.

This shifting of workers according to need or opportunity is encouraged and aided regardless of whether the workers were brought in by the placement service for growers, or whether growers' or processors' organizations brought them. Excellent cooperation has been obtained in this by explaining to all concerned the mutual advantages of exchanging labor. If domestic workers are idle and foreign workers are still employed, it is recognized that Mexican nationals never fill an order for workers. The domestic workers are then referred and hired. This rarely occurs, as the need for foreign workers is carefully watched and they are seldom available in excess of actual need.

The farm placement service does refer workers brought in by a labor contractor, though frequently the contractor and employer work out arrangements without employment service assistance. Frequently contractors and their crews are referred or located in response to grower orders. Contractors or members of their crews would be referred to replace Mexican nationals.

The Washington State Employment Security Department has made it a practice to contact crews in the field and refer them to succeeding job openings. This practice is extended to all workers under the Annual Worker Plan whether they were recruited and scheduled by the department, processors, or individual growers. As an example, in a new area of irrigation within the Columbia Basin during 1961, 15 to 20 crews were referred from grower to grower by one of our field staff men. This feat was accomplished through close coordination of the Employment Security Department with each grower involved and with the aid of one or more field men employed by a Washington processor. The department has experienced only minor difficulty in transferring crews and groups of workers among growers and/or processors.

Other States--Referral to Other Areas. Because of the compactness of its agricultural area, it is possible in Delaware to transfer interstate workers to another crop activity on a day-haul basis. Maryland has been quite successful in encouraging interstate workers to take employment in other areas. Eight years ago about 9,000 workers were used as compared with 6,000 in 1961. This reduction was accomplished through the reassignment of workers to other parts of the state.

Michigan encourages interstate workers without prior commitments to take employment in other areas. This has proved successful for desirable crop activities, but for less desirable crop activites, often more than 50 per cent of the workers fail to report. Minnesota also contacts uncommitted interstate workers upon completion of a crop activity. Growers and processors provide transportation advances from one area of the state to another, if needed. Employers will also provide transportation expense in Ohio in many instances.

Interstate migrants are encouraged to work in other areas in Oregon, if they are needed and do not have commitments arranged previously in other states. This is accomplished through the Annual Worker Plan, as far as possible, by endeavoring to revise the schedule of available groups in response to orders from other growers in the area or clearance orders from other areas in the state. When orders are not available and the group is interested in an activity elsewhere in the state,a request for job development is forwarded to the area; a job is developed if possible; and an order is returned to the applicant holding office. If time does not allow for this, arrangements may be completed by telephone with confirmation thereafter by mail. Many other interstate workers are encouraged to work elsewhere in the state through guidance and job information given by farm placement personnel where time is insufficient or the wishes of the workers make scheduling impossible. Some growers do provide or advance cost of transportation for interstate workers from one part of the state to another.

Interstate migratory workers, once they have completed their initial scheduled work in Washington, are encouraged to accept other employment within the state, providing they have an open period on their prearranged work schedule. Workers available for other jobs are recruited and scheduled to secondary and tertiary employment through the efforts of Employment Security Department local offices. Local offices in areas of need provide regular clearance orders in areas of supply; workers may be referred to a specific employer, and the office can inform interested applicants of job conditions, transportation arrangements, wages, and housing before these applicants travel to the job site. Employers will advance transportation expenses on a loan basis from one area to another. This type of recruitment has been eminently successful through the years in which the Annual Worker Plan has been in use in the state of Washington.

Census of Seasonal Farm Workers

1) What methodology is followed and what procedures are used in determining the number of workers and the composition of the seasonal farm labor force in a given crop in a given area at a given time? Are these procedures uniform throughout the state? Is the same nomenclature used throughout the state? Are these procedures satisfactory, if not, why not? How accurate are these estimates or tabulations of seasonal farm workers?

Explanation. The weekly census or estimate of the number of workers is very important as it provides information on workers employed, location, and crop activity. These reports take on added importance in Colorado, because they are used in determining labor needs for the following year.

The field study showed that there is no consistency from area to area in the way in which these estimates are made. In some areas, a field count is made of a selected sample of growers, and projections are made from these sample field counts. In other areas, growers' associations and processors are relied on for information on the number of workers. In some instances, a combination of both of these approaches is used. The problem of reliability is compounded further by the fact that crop activity categories vary from area to area, and even within areas, on the department's weekly reports.

The field study indicates the following possible inaccuracies in the weekly seasonal farm labor reports:

1) Arkansas Valley (1961) -- number of interstate workers low, number of intrastate high

2) San Luis Valley (1961) -- number of interstate workers low

3) San Juan Basin (1961) -- number of both intrastate and interstate highly inflated (appears to have been corrected in 1962)

Employment Department. The weekly farm labor report totals are only estimates but are quite accurate; the local area officials making out these reports are experienced in making these estimates, and, while there are bound to be errors, the proportion of error is small. The Colorado reports are as accurate as those in other states, regardless of the methodology used in other states.

Other States. Most of the seasonal farm workers employed in Delaware are in crews or contract groups. Local farm placement representatives keep a tally on these groups, covering the number of workers, sex, place of origin and equipment (trucks, buses, etc.). A relatively large number of workers can be accounted for with little effort. As groups are transferred, records are changed. Their tabulations are rather accurate, with a possible 10 per cent error in periods of rapid change in employment.

Michigan reports that it is believed that the unit bench marks calculated from labor requirement surveys and their application to acreage or trees and yields by county is the most accurate way of computing preseason and inseason estimates for a given reporting area. Inseason estimates can be further checked for accuracy after the final statewide acreage and production reports are released by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

In Oregon, the methodology and procedures used in determining the number of workers and the composition by source of the seasonal farm labor force in a given crop in a given area at a given time involve the application of a scientific sampling technique, using grower reports collected by mail, phone, or in person and computing the estimate for 100 per cent of the acreage as per its proportion to the percentage thereof in the sample, which is as representative as possible. A random selection is made from all average growers in an area to obtain the sample. The reports of this sample are blown up and the results added to reports from 100 per cent of very large or otherwise unusual growers, if any. These procedures are uniform throughout the state for all of the more significant crop activities. For those crop activities where few workers are involved, the reported figure is an informed estimate, based on grower, processor, and field representative opinion plus the observation of the local office farm placement representative who makes the estimate.

The Agricultural Employer Establishment Reporting Program in Washington is used in determining (estimating) the number of workers and the composition of the seasonal farm labor force in a given area at a given time. While this particular method of obtaining information direct from employers is not universal throughout the state (the farm placement section administrative office is in the process of installing this reporting program in additional local offices at the present time), a common nomenclature is used, since all of these reports are coordinated by the administrative office farm placement sections statistician. This type of information is believed to be basically sound and, along with the Bureau of Census farm report (published every five years) and information gathered from food processors, provides a comprehensive basis for determining, closer than ever before, the number of workers and composition of workers in a given area at a given time.

Formal Contract for Domestic Workers

1) Would the proposed federal legislation (S.1129) providing contractual arrangements between growers and domestic workers on a voluntary basis be of help in organizing the seasonal farm labor market in Colorado?

Explanation. This proposed legislation, which was not acted upon favorably during the 87th Congress, is expected to be introduced again. This legislation would establish a program for domestic workers similar to the ones covering foreign workers and Puerto Ricans. Agricultural employers would pay a recruiting fee not to exceed $15 per worker. For this fee, the Secretary of Labor would furnish food, transportation, housing, and emergency medical care to domestic workers and their families while in transit. Another worker would be furnished free of charge for each worker who failed to fulfil his agreement. The workers under this program would be assured of: 1) prevailing wage rate; 2) housing and sanitation conditions conforming to labor department standards; and 3) guaranteed employment of 160 hours in each four-week period.

Bureau of Employment Security.[18] Officials from the Denver Regional Office of the U. S. Bureau of Employment Security said that there was considerable objection to this legislation from the Farm Bureau and growers' associations. One major objection is that farmers who had been receiving employment department services free would now be required to pay a maximum fee of $15 for each job filled. Further, there is no assurance that domestic workers would fulfil their part of the bargain, which would necessitate worker replacement, and such replacement might be difficult. Braceros come to this country as solo workers, while domestic workers would be recruited without regard to family status. Many growers would object to providing adequate housing for family groups because of the cost involved. The proposed act, however, would be voluntary rather than compulsory, so that growers would not be required to participate and could still obtain workers as they do at present.

One result from this legislation might be to increase the number of solo domestic migrants. This would be desirable for several reasons other than the availability of housing. For example, it might make it possible for migrant families to become permanent residents in an area, even though the head of the family is still working in a number of different places; however, many migratory workers would probably refuse to leave their families, and others need to have other family members working in order to assure enough money to cover the winter months.

Employment Department. The director of employment said he didn't know to what degree such a program would be implemented should it pass Congress but expressed his opinion that a pilot program should be tried first. There are many unknowns in implementing such a new program, and growers should not be forced into difficulty because of the zeal with which bureaucrats put a new program into effect.

There is only one substantial source of domestic seasonal farm labor which had not yet been tapped to any great extent -- the large number of unemployed farm workers in Louisiana. It is possible that these workers would prove to be satisfactory in Colorado, but the director cautioned against bringing them in in large numbers under S. 1129 until this could be determined. Instead, he recommended one or two crews of 25 or 50 be brought in the first year, with the program to be expanded further in following years if the experience proved successful.

---

[18] Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of January 18, 1962.

Activities of the Farm Placement Service

The employment department was asked several questions on the activities of the farm placement service covering: 1) working arrangements with growers' associations and processors; 2) recruitment activities in other states; and 3) budgetary expense for farm placement service operations.

Table 94 shows the growers' associations, large individual growers, and processors with whom the employment department worked in 1961. Also shown is the total labor need of each, number of workers requested, number of braceros used, and domestic labor supplied.

Cost of Farm Labor Activities. During fiscal year 1961, the employment department spent 74,302 hours on farm labor activity; 6,559 hours of this total were spent on out-of-state recruitment. The total number of hours devoted to farm labor was the equivalent to 43.6 full-time positions. The estimated total cost of the farm labor program in fiscal 1961 was $218,000. The cost to the department for recruitment activities in Texas and New Mexico was $28,983. Recruitment in Texas accounted for $25,734 and recruitment in New Mexico, $3,250.

The employment department recruited in New Mexico in 1961 for the following processors and growers' associations: American Crystal Sugar Company, Empire Field Crops, Holly Sugar Corporation, National Sugar Company, and Great Western Sugar Company. In the Texas Panhandle, the employment department recruited for three sugar companies: Holly, National, and Great Western.

The Bracero Program

The temporary relocation of Mexican nationals to assist in agricultural production in the United States was first arranged in 1942 by executive agreement between the two nations. In 1951, the U. S. Congress passed Public Law 78, which provided for the recruitment and employment of Mexican nationals as agricultural laborers in this country.

Under the terms of Public Law 78, employers who use Mexican nationals are required to enter into an agreement with the United States government covering the following: 1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guarantee of such employers' contracts; 2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred for the transportation and subsistence of Mexican nationals, not to exceed $15 per worker; and 3) to pay to the United States an amount determined to be equal to the cost of returning a Mexican national to the reception center in those instances in which such worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract.

TABLE 94

Growers' Associations and Processors Served By the Colorado Department of Employment, 1961

Name of Assn. or Processor	Location	No. of Members	Total Labor Need	No. of Workers Requested	No. of Braceros Used	No. of Domestic Workers Supplied
Walsh Farm Group	Walsh	41	400	400	200	125
Empire Field Crops		335	3,000[b]	1,200	859	341
San Luis Valley Growers Assn.	Alamosa	83	2,066	1,909	1,144	1,148
Peach Board of Control[a]	Palisade	550	5,454	4,000	None	1,908
Mizokami Brothers	Blanco		1,073	1,053[c]	220	207
Zinno Produce Co.	Pueblo		200	200	99	71
Diven Packing Co.	Fowler		50	50	30	20
E. C. Ricketts	Crowley		75	75	45	30
Holly Sugar Corp.	Colorado Springs		697	697	360	337
Great Western Sugar Co.	Denver		10,000[d]	6,017	4,917	1,100
Fort Lupton Canning Co.	Fort Lupton		670	670	13	657
Dreher Pickle Co.	Fort Collins		750	750	563	187
Kuner-Empson Co.	Brighton		1,177[e]	1,177	387	790
Western Foods Co.	Fort Lupton		400	400	236	164
Henderson Pickle Co.	Henderson		150	150	30	120

---

a. Peach Board of Control, Mesa County Peach Marketing Order; this organization is not a farm labor or grower association in the usual sense. The Board of Control represents, at this time, 550 peach producers.

b. Empire Field Crops - Several of their members recruit on their own.

c. Mizokami Brothers - Recruit part of their labor using their own bus.

d. Great Western Company is able to supply a large number of workers through their own labor recruitment organization.

e. The Kuner-Empson Company total labor need includes their Grand Junction operation. When crops are completed on the eastern slope workers are transferred to the western slope.

No workers are to be recruited under the provisions of Public Law 78, unless the U. S. Secretary of Labor has certified that: 1) there is not a sufficient supply of domestic workers in the area; 2) employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic workers similarly employed; and 3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and hours of work comparable to those offered foreign workers.

Public Law 78 originally was scheduled to expire in 1953, but there have been several extensions, the last of which was enacted at the 1961 session of Congress and extended the termination date to December 31, 1963. The Public Laws which provided for these extensions also made some other changes in this legislation. These changes included the following: 1) Employers who provide transportation which is equivalent to that provided by the U. S. Department of Labor are not required to make monetary reimbursement. 2) The U. S. Department of Labor has the authority to secure the assistance of both agricultural employers and workers in determining the availability of domestic labor and the effect of the employment of Mexican nationals on prevailing wage rates and working conditions. 3) Mexican nationals may not be employed to operate power driven machinery or in certain processing industries, and they are prohibited from permanent, year-round work.

In carrying out the terms of the agreement signed with the Mexican government pursuant to Public Law 78 and subsequent legislation, the U. S. Department of Labor has promulgated rules and regulations covering the various aspects of Mexican national employment, such as housing, sanitation, working conditions, and prevailing wages. State employment departments assist the U. S. Department of Labor in determining prevailing wage rates, which the agreement requires must be paid to Mexican nationals.

1961 Legislation

There were several legislative proposals before Congress in 1961 with respect to extending the expiration date of Public Law 78. Two measures (H.R. 6032 and S. 1195) would have required that eligibility to employ Mexican nationals would be limited to employers who offer domestic workers wages at least equal to average farm wages in the state or nation, whichever is lower. Employers would not have been required to raise their wages more than $.10 per hour in any one year to meet the average. Further, eligibility to employ braceros would have been restricted to employers making reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers by offering -- and actually providing -- terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered foreign workers.

These bills would also have limited the employment of Mexican nationals to seasonal and temporary jobs not involving the operation of machinery. (This is the only provision which was adopted in the measure approved to extend the expiration date of Public Law 78.) The Secretary of Labor would have been authorized to limit the number of foreign workers who could be employed by any one farmer to the extent necessary to assure active competition for domestic farm labor.

The bill extending Public Law 78 which was adopted by the House contained no modifying provisions. The Senate amended this measure by adding the following: 1) restriction against permanent employment and employment involving machinery; and 2) requirement that employers of braceros pay at least 90 per cent of state or national average farm wages, whichever is lower. The first amendment was approved by the conference committee and the second amendment rejected.

Wage Determination

After the extension of Public Law 78 was approved without any change in the wage rate provisions, it appeared likely that the Secretary of Labor would exercise his authority under the original act to determine to what extent bracero wages have a depressing effect upon domestic wages.[19]

Department of Labor Hearings

During the first few months of 1962, the U. S. Department of Labor held hearings in major bracero-employing areas to study the effects of the program on the wages, conditions, and job opportunities of domestic workers. These were the first hearings held since the current program was established in 1951. In connection with these hearings, one of which was held in Denver, the Secretary of Labor announced new wage rates for the employment of Mexican nationals in several states. Growers' association and processor representatives appearing at the hearings (including the one in Denver) generally took the position that the Secretary of Labor lacked authority to set a wage rate for braceros and that his authority was limited to determining that the prevailing wage in the area was being paid Mexican nationals. In the only court test of this authority, the Secretary of Labor was upheld by the U. S. District Court in Washington, D. C. The court said in reaching its decision that Public Law 78 "...gives the Secretary broad powers and wide discretion..."[20]

Table 95 shows the hourly rates for braceros in several states established by the Secretary of Labor in 1962. Also shown is the 1961 average hourly farm wages.

---

19. Information Letter #17, National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, October 1961, p. 2.
20. Information Letter #19, National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, April 1962, p. 2.

TABLE 95

Bracero Wage Rates Established in 1962 and Average Farm Wage in 1961 for Selected States[a]

State	Bracero Rate	Average Farm Wage
Arizona	$ .95	$ .99
Arkansas	.60	.73
California	1.00	1.27
Colorado	.90	1.13
Michigan	1.00	1.09
New Mexico	.75	.87
Texas	.70	.80

a. Information Letter #19, National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, April, 1962, p. 2.

A number of Colorado growers and spokesmen for associations and growers complained at the Denver hearing that they were being unfairly discriminated against because the proposed rate for Colorado (then $1.00 per hour, but subsequently lowered to $.90 per hour) was higher than those proposed for New Mexico and Texas. The hourly rate established in 1962 preserves the differential between Colorado and its labor supply states of New Mexico and Texas. The gap was narrowed between Colorado and Texas and only slightly increased between Colorado and New Mexico as indicated in Table 95A.

TABLE 95A

Relationship of Bracero Wage Rates, 1961 and 1962 In Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas

State	1961 Rate	1962 Rate	Pct. of Increase	Pct. of Colo. Rate 1961	Pct. of Colo. Rate 1962
Colorado	$.75 per hr.	$.90 per hr.	20.0%	--	--
New Mexico	.65	.75	15.4	86.7%	83.3%
Texas	.50	.70	40.0	66.7	77.8

The bracero wage differential between Texas and Colorado is a major cause of concern for Colorado growers. Colorado growers, aside from wage differences, are handicapped in competing with the Rio Grande Valley, because of climatic conditions, length of growing season, and farm size. The wage differential adds to this handicap, especially since Texas has an abundant supply of resident domestic labor in addition to easy access to Mexican nationals. A number of Texas migrants who were interviewed reported that they had left their home state to find employment, because they were offered jobs in Texas at $.25 to $.40 an hour less than the $.50 an hour minimum for braceros at that time.

Effect of Bracero Wage Rates on Domestic Rates. The effect of the wage rates established for braceros on the rates paid domestic workers was discussed in the chapter on the Arkansas Valley. It is appropriate, however, to summarize that discussion here.

The prevailing wage provision was placed in Public Law 78 for two reasons: 1) to protect domestic workers from having their wage levels depressed through the employment of braceros at a lower rate; and 2) to assure the Mexican government that its citizens would be paid a wage commensurate with that received by American workers.

Experience has indicated that this provision of Public Law 78 has not worked exactly as expected. In the Arkansas and San Luis valleys, the rate set for Mexican nationals by the Secretary of Labor during the past three years has tended also to be the rate paid domestic workers. It can be argued, as the Secretary of Labor has, that if the rate set for Mexican nationals in one area is lower than in other areas, and the rate for domestic workers is pegged at the same level, domestic workers will go elsewhere, thus creating a domestic labor shortage and assuring a need for braceros. Because of this apparent interrelationship between wage rates for domestic and Mexican national workers, the Secretary of Labor, in effect, is setting a minimum wage for an area when he establishes the wage rate for Mexican nationals. This is one reason why many growers in the Arkansas and San Luis valleys have objected strongly to the 1962 ruling pegging the wage rate for Mexican nationals at $.90 an hour.

Employment of Mexican Nationals in Colorado

Approximately 10,000 different Mexican nationals have been employed in Colorado during the past two growing seasons.[21] Almost all of these workers have been concentrated in three areas: The Arkansas and San Luis valleys and Northern Colorado. Peak employment of braceros from 1957 through 1961 was as follows:

1957 - 6,121
1958 - 6,373
1959 - 5,926
1960 - 6,573
1961 - 6,456

In 1960, Colorado ranked ninth among the 37 states using foreign labor in the peak number of foreign workers employed.[22] It is interesting to note that Colorado was employing slightly more than 41 per cent of the Mexican nationals working in this country in sugar beets during June, 1960, while this state has only 15 per cent of the national sugar beet acreage.[23]

---

[21] The Seasonal Agricultural Market in Colorado, op. cit., p. 136.

[22] Annual Report of Employment of Foreign Workers, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, February 14, 1961, p. 1.

[23] Ibid., p. 9.

In 98 per cent (2,025) of the 2,060 farms on which braceros were employed in 1959, these workers were sponsored by either a growers' association or processor.[24]

Only 35 individual farmers sponsored braceros, in addition to those brought in by growers' associations and food processors. Processors in Colorado sponsor braceros for a larger number of farms than processors in any other state using Mexican nationals. To a certain extent this comparison may merely be a reflection of the fact that Colorado farms on the average are smaller in size than those in other major bracero-contracting states (such as California and Texas); nevertheless, the pattern of bracero sponsorship in Colorado is significantly different from that in other states.

At the January 18, 1962 meeting of the Migrant Labor Committee, Bureau of Employment Security officials were asked if they could explain this difference in bracero sponsorship and whether they thought that the payment of transportation and recruitment fees by processors had a direct bearing on the scope of the Mexican national program in Colorado. It was their opinion that processors recoup recruitment and transportation costs through charges assessed to the growers using bracero labor, so that the pattern would not be much different if the costs were paid initially by individual growers. Some processors interviewed during the field study, however, stated that they did not recover bracero recruitment and travel costs, and a few growers interviewed stated that they would not use braceros if they had to pay these fees.

Reactions to the Bracero Program

Pro. By and large, growers have strongly supported the bracero program, although there have been some objections to the numerous rules and regulations with which they must comply in order to secure the employment of Mexican nationals. Not the least of these objections is the cost of meeting housing and sanitation standards, which some employers consider excessive, especially for the comparatively short time Mexican nationals are employed. It is argued that the program is needed because of a shortage of dependable domestic labor. In part, this shortage results from the inability of the farm sector of the economy to compete for high cost labor with the industrial sector. A corollary argument is that many domestic workers, even when available, will not do stoop crop work, such as sugar beet hoeing and thinning and tomato and cucumber harvest. A number of growers indicated during the field study interviews that the elimination of the Mexican national program would either force them out of business or force them to change to other crops.

Another argument in favor of the program is that it extends a helping hand to the Mexican economy by providing employment opportunities to workers with extremely depressed economic circumstances. These workers return home with most of their earnings, which stimulates the Mexican economy and improves Mexican agriculture. Further, the program has eliminated the "wetback" problem.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p.12.

Con. Opponents of the Mexican national program take the position that employment of braceros has depressed the wage level for domestics (the position apparently taken by the Secretary of Labor in setting higher minimums). It is also pointed out that Mexican nationals have greater legal protections than do domestic workers. Housing and sanitation, standards, working conditions, and insurance protection are all superior for braceros as compared with domestics.

The argument is made that the availability of Mexican nationals has slowed up the trend toward mechanization in some crops and in some areas. As long as an assured labor supply is available, growers do not have as great an incentive to mechanize. Further, it is contended that domestic workers are available and would work in all crop activities if wages were higher and if they had some of the guarantees given Mexican nationals.

There has been some community reaction against the bracero program on the grounds that Mexican nationals spend very little while they are here as compared with domestic workers. In 1961, Mexican nationals earned $3,829,926 in Colorado. Approximately 85 per cent of these earnings were taken back to Mexico or $3,155,000 million.[25]

Economic assistance to Mexico is desirable, but it is argued that this assistance should not be at the expense of American workers. It is also argued that the wetback problem has been overstated.

Future of the Bracero Program

The different positions on the future of the bracero program may be summarized as follows:

1) continuation of the program with removal of some of the present restrictive and regulatory features;

2) continuation of the program as is;

3) continuation of the program with more restrictive provisions; and

4) elimination of the program.

There is another point of view that the program should be eliminated as soon as possible, but only if there is an assured supply of domestic labor. Efforts should be made to establish a program for domestic workers providing the same guarantees as the bracero As such a program and related recruitment efforts develop an assured and scheduled supply of domestic labor, the number of Mexican nationals should be gradually reduced and ultimately eliminated.

---

25. Colorado Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of January 18, 1962.

OTHER PROBLEMS AND PROGRAMS

Health

Brief History of Migrant Health Programs and Services

In 1954, a special migrant project was begun by the Maternal and Child Health Section of the Colorado State Department of Public Health. Prior to the inauguration of this program, there was practically no health or medical service available to migratory workers and their families.[1] The 1954 program had two objectives: 1) to stimulate and assist the provision of health services which would be available to migrant workers in local areas; and 2) to stimulate and assist migrant workers to utilize such services. The department is aided financially through an annual grant from the U.S. Children's Bureau. This annual grant is now slightly more than $40,000.

Since 1954, programs have been operated in four areas of the state: Arkansas Valley (Otero County), San Luis Valley, Western Slope (Mesa County), and Northern Colorado (Fort Lupton camp). The programs in all areas but one have been more or less continuous on an annual basis since 1955. There was a migrant health nurse employed in the San Luis Valley in 1956 during potato harvest, throughout the growing season in 1957, during part of 1958 and all of 1959.[2]

Health Problems

In areas where the migrant workers are employed, the organization of facilities for providing health services ranges from practically none to complete health units, but in most communities some interested groups can be found who for one reason or another are willing to concern themselves with improving conditions. The task is made more difficult by the results of changing agricultural practices and the inevitable variations in growing conditions, so that both the number and type of worker may vary from year to year.

Experience of local and state health personnel over the years has shown the general types of problems which will arise among temporary residents in agricultural communities during the summer. These include: 1) acute infections, particularly of the gastro-intestinal tract: 2) maternity and infant care; 3) major surgery; 4) long-term problems such as crippling orthopedic conditions; 5) epilepsy: 6) heart disease; and 7) dental problems. There is reason to believe that much malnutrition exists among the migrants, and without help their dietary practices will tend to deteriorate rather than improve as they use more and more ready prepared foods and abandon their traditional simpler diet.

---

1. Governor's Survey Committee on Migrant Labor, December, 1951, p. 8.
2. All of these programs are discussed in detail in the area chapters.

Local facilities for medical and dental care and preventive health services are practically never fully utilized by the migrants. Where they are used, the lack of continuity and follow-up reduce the value of temporary treatment. This experience points to the need for an on-going regional program in which some continuity can be developed in the health services the transients receive or are able to secure for themselves.

Obstacles to Health Care Utilization

A major obstacle to migrant utilization of health and medical services appears to be the high cost of hospital and medical care (especially in relation to migrant income) and the reluctance of some hospitals to assume the deficit which may result from providing migrant care. Variations in the stringency with which residence restrictions are applied in different areas also affect the availability of medical and hospital care for many migrants; most migrants do not stay long enough in any one place to establish residence. It is highly probable that the attitude of the migrants toward health and medical services and the determination with which they will seek to avail themselves of such services are affected not only by these economic and geographic factors but by cultural factors, which have been studied to some extent but about which not enough is yet known.

Occupational Health Problems

Not much is known about the magnitude and types of occupational health problems affecting seasonal farm labor in Colorado. The occupational health section of the state health department has been planning to establish a field study of these problems in connection with the area migrant health projects.

Studies of occupational health problems of agricultural workers have been made in a few other states, notably California. California studies have shown farm workers are subject to a number of occupational diseases, the most prevalent of which are systemic poisoning, respiratory infections, and dermatitis.[3] Major causes of these diseases were found to be: halogenated hydrocarbon pesticides, organic phosphate pesticides, cyanamide and other weed killers, lead and arsenic compounds, and other pesticides and fertilizers.[4]

Dermatitis may also result from handling certain crops which have not been chemically treated, according to another occupational health study.[5] This study also cited a number of fungus and bacterial infections which are potential occupational health hazards.

---

[3] Reports of Occupational Disease Attributed to Pesticides and Agricultural Chemicals, State of California, Department of Public Health, 1957, p. 17.

[4] *Ibid.* , p. 18.

[5] Industrial Medicine and Surgery, "Occupational Health on the Farm -- A Symposium," Volume 24, Number 3, March 1955, pp. 117 and 118.

California has also compiled data on agricultural work injuries; aside from occupational diseases, the most prominent of these are: 1) strains, sprains, dislocations, and hernias; 2) bruises and contusions; 3) cuts, lacerations, punctures, and abrasions; 4) fractures, and 5) eye injures.[6] The major causes of these work injuries are listed as: 1) motor vehicles and machinery: 2) strain and overexertion: 3) loss of footing; and 4) falling or flying objects.[7]

Health Department Request

The health department is preparing a request for a federal grant of $75,000 to finance a special migrant health project. It is proposed that this project include sanitation, occupational health, nutrition, and tuberculosis control. This project, if approved, would be in addition to the present program. If the funds are approved, the health department hopes to hire a nutritionist, two full-time sanitarians, four summer sanitarians, a dental hygienist, and a migrant nurse for the San Luis Valley.

Housing and Sanitation

Studies and Legislation Since 1950

The Governor's Survey Committee on Migratory Labor in 1951 found that housing for migrants was "inadequate and unsatisfactory in some areas of the state." Fourty-two per cent of the migrant families in 1950 lived in labor camps and nearly 50 per cent in houses provided by growers. Only 17 per cent of the households provided for migrants had rooms used solely for sleeping purposes. Many of the camps had poor sanitation facilities; families were crowded into one or two rooms; some had inadequate cooking facilities and water supplies.

The 1951 Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor recommended that: 1) legislation should be considered to give the state department of health power to enforce compliance with minimum standards in farm labor housing and sanitation if it is determined that it does not have such authority; and 2) the state department of health should formulate reasonable rules and regulations providing for minimum standards for farm labor housing and sanitation.

Legislation to implement the Governor's Committee's recommendations was introduced in the 1951, 1953, and 1955 sessions of the General Assembly. This legislation, had it been approved, would have established a migrant labor board whose powers and duties,

---

6. Work Injuries in California Agriculture, 1960, State of California, Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics and Research, June 1961, p. 15.
7. Ibid., pp. 7 and 8.

among others, would have included:

1) prescription of minimum standards for migrant labor camps' structural conditions;

2) inspection to encourage minimum standards of housing and sanitation in such camps;

3) consultation with employers of migrant labor as to the ways and means of improving living conditions for migrant workers;

4) cooperation with appropriate state agencies.

Legislation on migrant housing was introduced but not approved in the 1961 session of the General Assembly (House Bill No. 414). This bill prescribed standards for migrant camps and provided that these standards must be met before a license would be issued by the state health board. Camps found to be in violation of the act's provisions, could be closed as a public nuisance.

Present Housing and Sanitation Status

The state department of health and the state health board appear to have the statutory authority to promulgate housing and sanitation standards for migratory labor camps. Following is a summary of these statutory provisions:

66-1-8 (4) CRS 1953--authorizes the state board of health to issue orders, adopt rules and regulations, and establish standards which it deems necessary to administer and enforce the public health laws of the state.

66-1-7 (5) CRS 1953--authorizes the department to establish and enforce minimum general sanitary standards pertaining to the quality of water supplied to the public and to the quality of effluent of sewerage systems and trade wastes.

66-1-7 (13) CRS 1953--authorizes the department to establish and enforce sanitary standards for the operation of industrial and labor camps.

66-2-6 CRS 1953--authorizes county health departments to carry out state laws and regulations. Subsection (10) of this section authorizes county departments to make necessary sanitary and health investigations on its own initiative or in cooperation with the state department on matters affecting public health within the jurisdiction and control of the department.

While the department of health has the necessary statutory authority to make regulations and inspect facilities, these statutes do not contain penalty provisions, making enforcement difficult. Because of the Casey decision[8] handed down by the Colorado Supreme Court, in which the court held that violation of a regulation could not be construed as a misdemeanor without proper statutory authority, the department is examining all its statutes, rules, and regulations with the aim of suggesting needed statutory revision to the General Assembly.

An opinion on the health department's authority with respect to migrant housing was requested from the attorney general by a member of the Migrant Labor Committee. In his reply, the attorney general stated" . . . under the statutes cited above,the State Department of Public Health has the authority to adopt regulations directed at the control of health and sanitary matters in migrant labor camps."[9] The attorney general added that "there appears to be ample power and authority, therefore, for the enforcement of public health regulations by injunction and for the enforcement of the public health laws by both criminal prosecution and injunction."[10]

Committee Housing Examination[11]

During the past two years, the committee and field staff have examined all types of housing for migrant workers (both in camps and on the farm). Some of this housing was either good, or at least adequate, but some of it could not be considered adequate, even by minimum standards. Of special concern was the lack in many places of even minimum proper sanitary conditions. Lack of proper sewage and garbage disposal and inadequately protected water supplies can have a detrimental effect on nearby communities, as well as on the people living in the migrant housing.

In examining migrant housing, cognizance was taken that migratory workers live in this housing for a relatively short period of time. Failure to recognize this fact could lead to recommendations for housing standards which would be more restrictive than necessary, creating a considerable burden for growers. Further, housing conditions for migrants must be considered in light of resident housing in the same area. In some places, a portion of the resident housing is equally as bad as that provided for migrants. Many migrants also have poor housing in their state of residence, but the migrant interviews indicate that if many of these workers had sufficient income to afford better housing at their home base, they would not join the migrant stream year after year. The field study results indicate that adequate housing is an asset in attracting and keeping workers and is often a consideration in the worker's decision as to whether to return to the same farm or area in following years.

---

[8] Casey v. People, 336 Pacific 2nd 308.

[9] Letter from Attorney General Duke W. Dunbar to Representative H. Ted Rubin, November 27, 1961.

[10] Ibid.

[11] This subject has been covered in detail in the preceding area chapters.

Proposed Legislation for the Regulation of Migrant Labor Camps

At the September 26, 1962, meeting of the Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee, the state health department presented a proposed statute to regulate the licensing and inspection of migrant labor camps by the health department. The provisions of this legislation follow:

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this act:

(a) AGRICULTURAL LABOR CAMP includes one or more buildings or structures, tents, trailers, or vehicles, together with the land appertaining thereto, established, operated, or used as living quarters for five or more seasonal or temporary workers engaged in agricultural activities, including related food processing.

(b) PERSON means an individual or group of individuals, association, partnership, or corporation.

(c) DEPARTMENT means the Colorado State Department of Public Health.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE ACT means Chapter 3, Article 16, Colorado Revised Statutes 1953, as amended or any successor law.

SECTION 2. RESPONSIBILITY FOR COMPLIANCE

Every person operating or maintaining an agricultural labor camp shall comply with the requirements of this act and of any regulations issued hereunder.

SECTION 3. PERMIT REQUIRED FOR OPERATION OF CAMP

No person directly or indirectly shall operate an agricultural labor camp until he has obtained from the department a permit to operate said camp and unless such permit is in full force and effect and is posted and kept posted in the camp to which it applies at all times during maintenance and operation of the camp.

SECTION 4. APPLICATION FOR PERMIT: ISSUANCE OF PERMIT

Application to operate an agricultural labor camp shall be made to the department in writing on a form and under regulations prescribed by the department. The department shall issue such a permit for the operation of an agricultural labor camp, if it is satisfied, after investigation or inspection, that the camp meets the minimum standards of construction, sanitation, equipment, and operation required by regulations issued under Section 6 of this act. Such permit shall be valid for 1 year unless revoked. It shall not be transferable. If an applicant is refused a permit, the department shall upon request afford the applicant a fair hearing, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the department.

SECTION 5. PERMIT MAY BE REVOKED

The department may, after complying with the applicable provisions of the administrative practice act, revoke a permit authorizing the operation of an agricultural labor camp, if it finds that the holder of such permit has failed to comply with any provision of this act or of any regulation or order issued hereunder.

SECTION 6. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS: PUBLIC HEARINGS REQUIRED; EFFECTIVE DATE: PUBLICATION

The department shall formulate and issue such rules and regulations, as it may find necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of persons living in agricultural labor camps, prescribing standards for living quarters at such camps, including provisions relating to construction of camps, sanitary conditions, light, air, safety protection from fire hazards, equipment, maintenance, and operation of the camp, and such other matters as may be appropriate for security of the life and health of occupants. Rules and regulations issued under this section shall be adopted and made effective in accordance with the applicable provisions of the administrative practice act.

SECTION 7. ENFORCEMENT; RIGHT OF ENTRY

The department shall administer and enforce the provisions of this act and regulations issued hereunder. The department and its authorized representatives may enter and inspect agricultural labor camps at reasonable hours and may question such persons, and investigate such facts, conditions, and practices or matters, as it may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provisions of this act or to aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this act or in the formulation of rules or regulations thereunder. It may, to the extent appropriate, utilize the services of any other state department or agency of the government for assistance in such inspections and investigations.

SECTION 8. COURT REVIEW

(a) Any person aggrieved by an order of the department denying or revoking a permit to operate an agricultural labor camp may, within 30 days after the permit is denied or revoked, petition the district court for a review of said action, praying that such order be modified or set aside.

(b) Any person aggrieved by any rule or regulation issued under section 6 of this act by the department, may within------days after the rule or regulation becomes effective petition the district court to modify or set aside such rule or regulation in whole or in part, but only on the ground that it is unlawful or unreasonable.

(c) A copy of the petition filed under subsections (a) or (b) above, shall be served upon the department. The department shall keep and, upon notice of filing of the petition, shall certify and file in the court, a full record in the proceeding before him upon which the action complained of is based. The review authorized in in subsections (a) and (b) above shall be limited to questions of law. Findings of fact by the department, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the district court.

SECTION 9. PENALTY

Any person failing to comply with any provision of this act, or with any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or interfering with, impeding, or obstructing in any manner, the department or its authorized representatives in the performance of their official duties under this act, shall be guilty of a violation of this act, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not less than------dollars nor more than------dollars or to imprisonment for not less than------nore more than------, or both such fine and and imprisonment, for each such offense.

SECTION 10. INJUNCTION

(a) Upon the determination by the department of any violation of the provisions of this act or any regulation issued under section 6, relating to agricultural labor camps, the department may serve the operator of such camp with an order requiring compliance with such provision or regulation within such time as the department determines is reasonable. It shall be sufficient service of such order, if it is posted in a conspicuous place upon the premises affected and a copy thereof mailed, on the same day it is posted, to the camp operator at the address filed by him in the department.

(b) If compliance with such provisions is not had within the period specified in the order of compliance, the department may institute proceedings to enjoin such violation in the district court of the judicial district within which any person charged with violating such provision of this act resides or is maintaining an agricultural labor camp, and such court shall have jurisdiction to issue temporary or permanent restraining orders or grant other appropriate equitable relief to assure compliance with the provisions of this act and any applicable rule or regulation issued thereunder.

(c) In order to adequately place and care for workers and their families housed in any such camp, the court to which application is made for such restraining order shall, prior to the granting thereof, require proof that notice of such application has been given to (a) the county agricultural agent, (b) the representative of the nearest office of the public employment service, whose duty it is to aid in placing such workers in suitable employment, and (c) the county welfare department.

SECTION 11. EFFECTIVE DATE

This act shall take effect-------------------.

Even if this bill were to become law, the health department does not have sufficient personnel or funds to carry out the inspection functions which would be required. Department officials estimated that $30,000 to $35,000 per year would be needed in order for the department to make periodic inspections of migrant labor camps.

Employment Department Housing Inspections

During the 1962 growing season, the state employment department inspected the migrant housing provided by growers who use labor supplied by the department or by processors and associations with whom the department works. Under a Bureau of Employment Security regulation, the department could refuse to supply interstate labor to any grower whose housing was found inadequate and who refused to correct the deficiencies reported by the department.

The employment department was concerned not only with obvious structural defects in housing units (broken windows, holes in floors and walls, leaking roofs), but also with the amount of floor space per worker, the availability and adequacy of cooking and heating equipment, the source and quality of the water supply, waste and garbage disposal, and many other items. The department reported that growers throughout the state seldom made any objection to the housing inspections, as long as department employees properly identified themselves before starting an inspection. When defects or deficiencies were found in housing, the farmer was notified of the defect and what type of action seemed necessary to correct it. The employment department reported good cooperation from growers in correcting the deficiencies noted during the housing inspections.

The department inspected 4,350 housing units in Colorado during 1962. For the most part, the inspections were made by regular area office personnel in addition to their regular duties. Of the 4,350 units inspected, 2,377 were found to be in good condition, 1,643 in fair condition, 224 in poor condition, and 106 units were not acceptable at the time of the inspection. Department staff members were refused admittance to inspect housing only 31 times throughout the state.

Regulatory Labor Legislation

Included in the category of regulatory labor legislation are the following: 1) minimum wages; 2) workmen's compensation; 3) unemployment insurance; and 4) child labor. Problems and considerations in applying these legislative enactments to seasonal agricultural labor are discussed by subject below.

Minimum Wage Legislation

Colorado statutes relating to minimum wage and hours of work for women and children, as indicated in the previous chapter, appear to be sufficiently broad to cover their employment as seasonal farm workers, but have never been so applied. Only two jurisdictions

(Hawaii and Puerto Rico) have specific minimum wage legislation applying to agricultural workers. Two other states (California and Wisconsin) have issued regulations applying to agricultural labor under their minimum wage legislation pertaining to women and children

There are some disadvantages connected with establishing a minimum wage rate for agricultural labor in one state. If such legislation set a minimum rate higher than the rates in surrounding and competing states, agricultural producers in Colorado would be at a competitive disadvantage. On the other hand, a low minimum rate (below the general average) set by legislation would accomplish little beyond a formal expression of public policy.

A national minimum wage for agricultural labor was proposed in the first session of the 87th Congress in 1961. This bill expired in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Even though, legislative efforts to establish a national minimum wage have been unsuccessful, the same effect may have been achieved through the minimum rates established for the employment of Mexican nationals. These minimums do not apply uniformly, even though these rates are set by federal ruling. The question may be raised as to whether a national minimum rate would be more equitable if applied uniformly as is the minimum for industrial workers or whether it would be more equitable to allow for variations which reflect different state by state wage patterns. If a minimum were applied uniformly, it would raise the wage level in the southern labor supply states. Growers in these states would argue that they were being discriminated against. Further, it might reduce the labor supply willing to travel to other states for employment. On the other hand, a differentiated minimum wage which gives recognition to state wage patterns would preserve the present competitive advantage of low income areas. Another question being given considerable study is the relationship between hourly rates and piece rates as they apply to minimum wage guarantees.

Workmen's Compensation

Workmen's compensation coverage for migratory labor on the same basis as industrial workers is provided in only 10 states. In another eight states, coverage is provided for agricultural workers in specific farm occupations, usually those involving the operation of machinery. The scope and extent of occupational diseases and work injuries in agriculture has already been mentioned; however, there is no available information on the effect of these diseases and injuries in Colorado.

There appears to be no way of covering migratory workers without extending coverage to all agricultural labor, nor would it be fair to residential farm workers to provide such coverage only for migrants. In most states, there has been considerable opposition to the extension of workmen's compensation coverage to all agricultural workers.

In Colorado, employers of agricultural labor may elect coverage under workmen's compensation and occupational disease legislation; few have done so, although a considerable number of growers have liability insurance coverage which applies to employees' injuries.

Unemployment Insurance Coverage

Only Hawaii has unemployment insurance coverage for agricultural workers, and this coverage is limited to employers of 20 ore more workers for 20 or more weeks. In all other states, agricultural labor is excluded, but, except in three of these states, voluntary coverage of agricultural workers is possible. This option has been exercised to any extent only in North Dakota.

While a method could be found to cover resident agricultural workers, it seems unlikely that a state acting independently could provide unemployment insurance coverage for domestic interstate migrants. There are two major obstacles to providing such coverage: 1) Migrant laborers seldom work long enough in any state except their state of residence to establish a base period necessary to qualify for coverage. 2) The addition of unemployment insurance coverage in one state and not in others might put growers in that state at a competitive cost disadvantage with growers in the other states.

It may be that the only feasible way to provide unemployment insurance for migrant workers would be on the national level, but no legislation has been proposed. It would seem premature to embark on a national unemployment insurance program for migrant workers, given the present fragmented condition of the seasonal farm labor market. More significant in providing a hedge against unemployment may be the federal proposal for voluntary contractual arrangements between growers and domestic migrant workers.

Child Labor

Colorado's child labor law prohibits employment (except agricultural employment) of children under age 14 during any portion of any month when public schools are in session. Any child under age 14, however, who is engaging in agricultural employment for persons other than his own parents must secure a permit from the superintendent of schools.[12]

A minimum age for agricultural work during school hours is established by statute in 15 states. In seven states, the minimum age is 16; in the others it varies from 12 to 15.

Federal legislation prohibits the employment of youngsters under 16 during school hours, and the minimum age for employment as provided in the federal Sugar Act is 14 years.

---

[12] 80-8-1 Colorado Revised Statutes, 1953.

Only a few children under the age of 12 were found during the field study to be working. Sugar beet growers have been very careful to adhere to the minimum age provisions of the Sugar Act, and no youngsters under 14 were found to be working in sugar beet pre-harvest activities.

Almost all activities requiring seasonal farm workers in Colorado take place during those months when school is usually not in session. The major exception is the San Luis Valley potato harvest, and schools are closed especially for this purpose. In other areas, domestic migrant families usually leave by the time school begins in the fall. Effort is being made in many areas in Colorado to get those migrant children enrolled who are here during the latter part of the regular spring term and the early part of the fall term. This effort has been stimulated by the provision of state funds to reimburse local school districts for the additional expense of having migrant youngsters in attendance during regular school sessions.

In those areas with special migrant summer schools, a number of migrant children were found who were working during the time school was in session. In many of these instances, the family preferred to have their children working to add to the family income, rather than having them attend school. Some older children were also kept at home to take care of the younger children while their parents worked. Either child care facilities were not available (the usual case) or the parents preferred not to use them.

Regulation of Labor Contractors and Crew Leaders

Nine states and Puerto Rico have laws and regulations applying specifically to farm labor contractors. Six of these laws expressly cover labor contractors who recruit farm workers for a fee. A few require crew leader registration, and one besides Colorado requires payroll records be kept and wage statements given.

Previous Recommendations and Legislative Proposals

The 1950-1951 Governor's Study Committee recommended that legislation be passed requiring labor contractors to post bond and to be licensed by the state at a substantial fee. No specific legislation affecting labor contractors or crew leaders was proposed prior to 1957. During the 1957 session of the General Assembly an amendment was offered to House Bill 202, which provided for a revision of the Industrial Commission's regulation of wage payments and wage claims. This amendment would have included labor contractors and crew leaders under these regulations. House Bill 202 ultimately passed the House without the amendment and was not reported out of committee in the Senate.

In 1959, House Bill 103 was introduced, which required contractors and crew leaders to keep payroll records and give wage statements to migratory workers. This measure also passed the House, but was not reported out of committee in the Senate.

House Bill 62. The General Assembly passed House Bill 62 during the 1960 session. This measure was generally similar to House Bill 103 (1959) and requires labor contractors and crew leaders to keep payroll records for three years on each migratory laborer (as defined in the act). These payroll records are kept on forms prescribed and furnished by the Industrial Commission and include hours worked, amount earned, and all withholdings. These records are required to be mailed to the commission on July 1 and December 1 of each year, or at any time a labor contractor leaves the state or terminates his contract.

Contractors and crew leaders covered by this legislation are required to give itemized statements to each migratory laborer or to the immediate family head of a working family unit. These statements include the wage rate, number of hours worked, wages earned, and all wage withholdings. The Industrial Commission is charged with the responsibility of making periodic reports on these records to the Governor's Interagency Committee on Migratory Labor.

Experience with House Bill 62 (1960)

During the first year House Bill 62 (1960) was in effect, the Industrial Commission was handicapped by a lack of funds to administer the act, which delayed the printing of forms and explanatory material and also necessitated the borrowing of field staff from other commission divisions. As the first step in administering H.B. 62, the commission prepared and circulated copies of the act and an explanation of its provisions. Posters calling attention to the act's provisions and application to labor contractors and crew leaders were placed in ports of entry, on farms, and in business establishments. Effort was also made by field staff members to contact labor contractors and crew leaders. The forms, posters, and other materials used were printed in both English and Spanish to facilitate better understanding.

Even though House Bill 62 did not provide for the registration of labor contractors and crew leaders, it was the opinion of the Industrial Commission that such registration was necessary as a control in administering the act. Consequently, the commission issued a regulation requiring each labor contractor and crew leader as defined in H.B. 62 to register with the commisssion. (Because there is no statutory requirement for registration, no penalty could be invoked against any labor contractor or crew leader for failing to do so.)

During the 1960 growing season, only one labor contractor or crew leader as defined in House Bill 62 (1960) was found. At that time the commission reported that the majority of farmers in most of the areas using migratory labor appeared to be paying wages directly and were keeping their own payroll and employment records. The growers assumed this function for two reasons: 1) Payroll information is needed by growers for tax reports. 2) Past abuses and unpleasant experiences with the labor contractor and crew leader system resulted in many farmers taking over payroll functions. Consequently, crew leaders in Colorado appear to be employees, acting as field foremen or "pushers" for which they receive additional compensation.

Crew leaders, according to the Industrial Commission at that time were making every effort to be classified as employees rather than employers; many even had written agreements with the farmers stating that they are employees. This action on the part of crew leaders was not an attempt to avoid compliance with the provisions of House Bill 62, and in fact preceded the passage of the act. It appears that the amendment to the social security act providing coverage for agricultural workers who earn $150 or work 20 days for one employer was the basic reason for this change. Under the provision of the amendatory legislation, crew leaders are considered to be employers unless they have written statements to the contrary from growers.[13]

1961-1962. The Industrial Commission reported that considerable progress was made in finding labor contractors who were within the definitions of House Bill 62. Twenty were registered and required to make reports as provided in the act. It was the opinion of the Industrial Commission field staff member responsible for administering House Bill 62 that the experience gained during the 1961 growing season would make better administration and enforcement of the act possible. There were still two major problems which made administration of the act difficult. First, the Industrial Commission still had insufficient funds and staff to carry out its responsibilities under House Bill 62 to the fullest extent. Second, the commission was continuing to require contractors and crew leaders to register without any statutory authority. Registration was considered necessary in order to enforce the wage statement and record keeping provisions of House Bill 62. It was suggested that the General Assembly consider an amendment to House Bill 62 which would make registration mandatory. Further, it was suggested that a penalty provision be added, so that steps could be taken against those contractors and crew leaders covered by the act who have ignored it completely.

Experience during the first part of the 1962 growing season was similar to that in 1961. Field work was largely curtailed after July, because the staff member handling the field work was assigned other duties on an emergency basis.

H.B. 396 (1961)

H.B. 396 (1961) introduced during the first session of the Forty-third General Assembly would have required the registration and licensing of labor contractors and crew leaders. Certain prerequisites for licensing were estalished, the posting of bond required, violations of the act enumerated, and penalties set forth. This bill was lost on second reading. The bill was opposed to a large extent because it was thought to be too restrictive and to impose undue hardships on contractors and crew leaders from other states. There was concern that the application of the provisions of the bill to non-resident contractors and crew leaders might cause them to by-pass Colorado, and thus reduce the available labor supply.

---

[13] The result of this precedure is to reduce the number of seasonal farm workers who meet the eligibility requirements for social security. Most seasonal farm workers change employment so frequently that they do not earn $150 from or work 20 days for any one grower. If the crew leader is the employer, then all hours worked and dollars earned, regardless of the number of growers involved, could be counted.

Problems and Alternatives

It has been recommended that House Bill 62 (1960) be amended to require the mandatory registration of crew leaders and labor contractors as defined in the act. It also has been recommended that penalties be provided for failure to register and for failure to comply with the other provisions of the act. As presently written, House Bill 62 is aimed at covering only those labor contractors and crew leaders who actually pay wages to workers. The question arises as to whether it is desirable and necessary to license all contractors and crew leaders, regardless of whether they pay workers directly. If so, what provisions should be made applicable to crew leaders and contractors who are residents of other states? In other words, is it possible to regulate these contractors and crew leaders so that growers and workers are protected, while at the same time not making the regulations so restrictive that a number of crews may by-pass Colorado as a consequence? One approach which appears to have merit is a national licensing and registration program. Such a measure was proposed during the first session of the 87th Congress in 1961, but was not reported out of committee.

The alternatives with respect to House Bill 62 and the regulation of crew leaders and contractors appear to be these:

1) House Bill 62 could be continued without amendment, either with or without additional funds made available to the Industrial Commission for its administration and enforcement. Under these circumstances, the results in future years would probably be similar to those achieved in 1961 and 1962, especially if it is administered on a part-time basis.

2) House Bill 62 could be amended to require mandatory registration of labor contractors and crew leaders as defined in the act, and penalty clauses could be added. This approach would probably result in better administration and enforcement of the act, even if additional funds are not made available to the Industrial Commission. A further advantage would be that the Industrial Commission would have the legal authority which it now lacks to require registration, and the penalty provisions would provide an enforcement tool.

3) The definitions contained in House Bill 62 could be expanded to include all labor contractors and crew leaders as far as registration and/or licensing is concerned, with the wage record provisions applying only to those within the present definitions in the act. If this were done, registration requirements should be carefully reviewed to make sure that: a) adequate protection is provided for growers and workers, and b) requirements are not so restrictive as to be prohibitive.

Transportation

Two state agencies--the State Highway Patrol and the Port of Entry Division, Department of Revenue--carry out state enforcement of safety standards for transporting migratory workers. State activity in this area is in addition to the regulations established and enforced by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The patrol is specifically interested in: 1) driving qualifications of vehicle operators; 2) vehicle equipment and operation; and 3) comfort and safety of the migrants and other highway users.

The patrol's functions concerning the transportation of migrants were spelled out in a statement to the Governor's Interagency Committee on Migratory Labor in 1961 as follows:

"Patrol officers make a special effort to contact vehicles in which migrants ride, explain Colorado traffic laws to drivers, give requested information, inspect drivers' licenses, ownership papers, and thoroughly inspect equipment. Vehicles found unsafe are held for repairs before being allowed to proceed. Where overloading is found the surplus passengers are unloaded and either distributed to other vehicles in the group, if any, or put aboard buses to their destination. Traffic violations are treated the same as under any other circumstances."

I.C.C. Regulations. The patrol cooperates with the Interstate Commerce Commission in seeing that its regulations on the transportation of migrants are followed. These regulations include requirements for safe vehicles in good condition with proper safety equipment. The driver must have passed a physical examination, be licensed in his state of residence, and have a sufficient knowledge of English to understand road signs and instructions. No driver may drive more than 16 hours in any 24-hour period, exclusive of rest stops, unless he has had eight hours' rest immediately prior to taking the wheel. There are also restrictions on the number of miles which may be traveled within a given period. Rest stops are required at periodic intervals, and there are specifications on seat construction and the amount of space per passenger. These regulations apply to all vehicles used in the transportation of migrants, except common carriers, passenger cars and station wagons.

Effect of I.C.C. Regulations. According to Interstate Commerce Commission officials, the result of these regulations --at least in Colorado--has been a shift in the method of transporting migrants. Rather than bother with compliance, most migrants are now traveling into the state by passenger car and station wagon; some are coming in via private buses or common carrier. Chief Gilbert Carrel of the state patrol told the Migrant Labor Committee that he agreed with this observation of I.C.C. officials. He said that the patrol had contacted 52 trucks transporting migrant in 1958, only nine in 1959, and only three in 1960. He added that to his knowledge there had not been any serious accidents involving migrants traveling in passenger cars and station wagons.[14]

---

14. Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of September 19, 1960.

Ports of Entry. For the past several years, the director of the POE division has traveled to the collection points for the transportation of migratory labor three to four weeks in advance of the first northward movement. His itinerary in 1960 included Socorro and Gallup, New Mexico, and El Paso, Texas. In these cities and in the county seats between Texas and Colorado, regulations and instructions for the transportation of migratory labor are distributed, in English and Spanish, through the sheriffs' offices. According to the POE division director, this procedure has enabled the ports to clear migratory vehicles in a minimum of time and has resulted in the provision of much safer transportation.

1961 Legislation

Legislation was introduced in the 1961 session of the General Assembly to regulate the transportation of migrant workers by truck in Colorado. Had this bill (Senate Bill No. 281) become law, it would have defined the requirements to be met for: 1) seating arrangements, 2) protection from the weather, and 3) means for ingress and egress from the passenger compartment. The bill also defined the maximum time that a truck transporting migrant workers could be driven without a rest stop and the time that had to be allowed for meal stops.

Method of Traveling to Colorado

During the field study conducted in the 1961 and 1962 growing seasons each interviewee was asked how he had traveled to Colorado. The methods of traveling to Colorado are shown in the following table. The number of interviewees arriving by truck was 421, only three less than the number arriving by auto.

Method of Travel to Colorado, Migrants Interviewed, 1961 and 1962

	Method of Travel			
Area	Bus	Truck	Auto	Other
Arkansas Valley	4	42	54	
San Luis Valley	4	107	137	5
Western Slope	53	159	85	15
San Juan Basin	4	24	13	
Northern Colorado	1	89	135	
State Total	66	421	424	20

The Western Slope and the San Juan Basin were the only areas of the state where more interviewees arrived by truck than by auto. On the Western Slope, one apparent reason for the large amount of truck transportation is the large number of workers who come to the peach harvest in contract crews. These crews are usually transported by trucks or buses. For the most part, the contract crews are made up of solo workers, and few family groups are involved. Family groups generally tend to travel by automobile.

In the San Juan Basin, the growers often go to the reservation and bring the workers back in their own trucks. In the San Luis Valley, the same situation existed. All of the Indians interviewed in the San Luis Valley during potato harvest had arrived by truck; in almost all cases the trucks were provided by growers who had gone to the reservation to transport the workers.

In all areas of the state, family groups tend to travel by auto, unless the family group is so large as to make a truck necessary.

Migrant Studies and Coordinating Committees

1950-1951 Migratory Labor Study

The last comprehensive official study in Colorado of the various aspects of the migratory labor situation was made in 1950-1951. Prior to his appointment to the federal bench, Governor Lee Knous established a Governor's Survey Committee on Migratory Labor. This committee consisted of professors, representatives of the various sugar companies, church and social welfare representatives, school representatives, union representatives, and several lay members. Technical assistance was provided by staff members of the following state agencies: welfare, employment, health, agriculture, education, vocational education, and the Industrial Commission.

This committee completed its study in December 1951, and its final report was presented in January 1952 to Governor Dan Thornton. A supplementary study was also made in 1950 by the Child Labor League at the request of Governor Walter Johnson. This supplementary study covered housing, income, and education of Colorado migratory workers. This report was also submitted to Governor Thornton.

Recommendations Contained in the 1950-1951 Study. As a result of its findings, the Governor's Committee made the following recommendations concerning a permanent migratory labor committee:

1. A permanent Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor should be established, composed of representatives of state agencies most concerned with this problem and citizens at large representing farmers, processors, organized labor, agricultural labor, and civic groups. This committee should be charged with the following responsibilities:
    a. coordinating the efforts of the various state agencies;
    b. reporting to the General Assembly and recommending necessary legislative action;

c. developing interstate cooperation;

d. developing cooperation with the federal government;

e. continuing to study migratory labor problems and the state's agricultural needs;

f. sponsoring an annual state conference on migratory labor.

Proposed Legislation 1951-1955

Many of the recommendations made by the 1950-1951 Governor's Study Committee concerning a permanent migratory labor committee were embodied in legislation introduced in 1951, 1953, and 1955. This legislation was introduced as House Bill 137 in 1951, as House Bill 401 in 1953, and as House Bill 114 in 1955. In brief, these bills proposed the following:

1) A migratory labor board would be created in the Department of Employment, to consist of the Director of Employment Security, Commissioner of Education, Director of the State Agricultural Extension Service, Director of the State Department of Health, Director of the State Department of Welfare, and the Chairman of the Industrial Commission.

   In addition, three public members would be appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate to serve for five-year staggered terms. Also on the board and serving as chairman would be the newly appointed director of the migratory labor division.

2) The migratory labor board would have the following powers and duties:

   a) approval of all rules, regulations, and procedures to carry out purposes of the act;

   b) coordination of the activities of the various agencies concerned with migratory labor;

   c) holding of public hearings on migratory labor and the work of the division and survey and study of the division's operations;

   d) preparation of reports annually and at such other times as it may deem appropriate to the Governor and the General Assembly;

   e) application for and acceptance, disbursement, or expenditure of federal grants as may further the purpose of this act.

Governor's Inter-Agency Committee on Migratory Labor

In 1958, Governor McNichols appointed an official committee on migratory labor, composed of representatives of several state agencies. This committee was not set up to make a comprehensive study; rather, the committee's functions were construed as follows:[15]

> To consult with and advise the Governor and his staff regarding migrant labor problems; to act as liaison on behalf of the Governor of the State of Colorado with the President's Committee on Migratory Labor and with other state committees to plan suitable programs of action and assist in their execution.

This committee was first set up unofficially by the heads of the departments of health, education, and welfare in the fall of 1957. The governor gave official designation to the committee in April, 1958. The main purpose of the committee is to serve as a liaison among the state agencies concerned with migratory labor and to advise the governor concerning migrant labor problems.

Represented on the committee are the following agencies: Market Division, Department of Agriculture; Port of Entry Division, Department of Revenue; Colorado State Patrol; Farm Placement Division, State Department of Employment; Child Welfare Division, State Department of Welfare; State Department of Education; Child and Maternal Health Section, Department of Health; and the governor's office.

A representative of the Colorado Conference on Social Welfare was added to the committee in 1959. The Colorado Conference's Migratory Labor Committee had requested official designation as the state committee, but the governor preferred to have the committee composed of state officials.

In general, the committee's meetings have been devoted to an exploration of some of Colorado's migrant labor problems, the functions of the various state agencies, and cooperation among them. In addition, the committee has given some consideration to the possibilities of interstate cooperation.

Prior to the latter part of 1961, this committee met rather infrequently. During 1962, the committee has held monthly meetings and has been considering possible legislation pertaining to seasonal farm workers and their families. The health department's proposal for labor housing standards was reviewed by this committee and presented to the Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor at its September 26, 1962 meeting.

---

[15] Letter, dated October 15, 1958, from Dr. Ruth Howard, Dept. of Health, to Miss Gwen Geach, Chief, Field Service Branch, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor.

Farm Labor Advisory Committee. The Governor's Farm Labor Advisory Committee is composed of growers, processors, and one representative of organized labor. This committee serves as a consultant to the state employment department on farm labor matters and is the only group besides the interagency committee to have official status.

Committees In Other States

Some 28 states have official migratory labor committees. These committees take different forms: some of them are interagency in character: other are combinations of government officials and laymen. Programs with which they are concerned cover all aspects of conditions which affect migratory workers and their families, such as housing, wages, transportation, schools, employment of children, child-care centers, health, and sanitation.

Education

Findings of the 1950-1951 Study. The Governor's Study Committee (1950-1951) reported that:

> The public schools were unable to take care of a seasonal, non-resident school population even if physical facilities were available, because of a lack of staff and other resources to provide a meaningful educational program for migrant children. Problems included: non-attendance and irregular attendance by migratory children, inadequate compulsory attendance law, retardation and grade placement problems, lack of cooperation from many migrant parents, lack of cooperation from some employers, closing of schools during harvest season, and overcrowding and disruption in the schools.

Since the findings of the Governor's Study Committee, Colorado has achieved national prominence in providing school programs for migrant children.

Migrant Summer Schools

In 1955 the state board of education approved a request from school district No. 50 of Morgan County for $1,500 to operate a summer school for migrant children at Wiggins. Thirty-one children were enrolled in this first six-weeks school, and everyone concerned felt the program was an eminent success.

The success of the Wiggins school prompted formation of one at Palisade in Mesa County in 1956. This school operated in the late summer, closing just before the regular schools opened for the fall term. Again,, response and successful accomplishment were evident.

In 1957, two more schools were operated. One was at Fort Lupton in Northern Colorado and the other was at Rocky Ford in the Arkansas Valley: school terms were from five to seven weeks.

The schools at Wiggins, Palisade, Fort Lupton, and Rocky Ford were again operated in 1958, and, in 1959, a fifth school was started at Fort Garland in the San Luis Valley. In 1959, the average cost per day attended in all schools was $3.09. Per pupil costs for the term varied from $67.11 at Wiggins to $132.40 at Ft. Lupton.

By 1960, the summer school operation had proved so successful that two new schools were opened in the San Luis Valley. The school at Ft. Garland was not operated in 1960, because of local conditions. At Monte Vista, a school limited to 18 children received pupils from a rural depressed area where agricultural workers made their permanent homes. The other new school in 1960 was at San Luis, also a home-base area for farm workers.

In 1961, special terms were again held at seven schools: Wiggins, Palisade, Ft. Lupton, Rocky Ford, Sierra Grande (Ft. Garland), San Luis, and Monte Vista. In 1962, however, the schools at Sierra Grande and Monte Vista did not operate, and the Ft. Lupton school was moved to Platteville.

U.S. Office of Education Grant

In 1958, the U.S. Office of Education gave the Colorado Department of Education a three-year grant of $36,100 to explore and determine adequate organization and education content for migratory school programs. This grant expired on December 31, 1960. This program was under the direction of Dr. Alfred Potts, the only professional department of education official directly concerned with migratory labor education, except for Mrs. Howard Latting, who, as the department's elementary education consultant, still devotes a considerable portion of her time to migrant classroom problems.

The grant given Colorado, according to Dr. Potts, was the first of its kind in the country. The U.S. Office of Education selected Colorado for this grant, because it was felt that Colorado was in the best position to undertake such a project as evidenced by the interest shown in this state and the number of school programs underway prior to the grant. The studies conducted under the grant and the results are not limited in application to Colorado. In fact, the U.S. Office of Education believes that the results will be useful to almost all other states with migrant education problems.

In Dr. Potts' opinion, Colorado has achieved national status as a leader in migrant education. Consequently, other states have sent officials here to consult with him, and he has been invited to other states in the same capacity. Oregon, Illinois, and New York have all sent officials to Colorado. While the contract with the U.S. Office of Education applied primarily to research, the department of education construed the terms quite broadly, because of the relationship between the operation of the school district programs and the research projects. As a result, Dr. Potts spent about 60 per cent of his time on program administration and consultation and only 40 per cent on research.

Financing of Migrant Summer Schools

From the start of the special summer terms for migrant children in 1955, up to and including the 1960 summer terms, the money for operating these schools came from the contingency reserve fund of the state public school fund. These funds were allocated by the State Board of Education. The annual total costs for the special summer schools is shown below:

1955	$ 1,426.10
1956	Not Available
1957	2,412.90
1958	12,080.84
1959	12,710.66
1960	8,508.27
1961	50,243.29
1962	41,035.27

In 1961, the General Assembly allocated funds from the contingency reserve fund for the education of migrant children. Ninety-nine thousand dollars was appropriated to be used for: 1) the special summer terms; 2) assisting school districts which enrolled migrant children during regular school terms; and 3) administration of the migrant school programs by the department of education. A total of $58,000 was made available for the 1961 special summer terms, of which $50,243.29 was expended. In 1962, the same amount of money was made available, and $41,035.27 was spent for the special summer terms for migrant children.

Regular Term Schools. Under the terms of House Bill 410(1961), school districts which had migrant children enrolled during the regular school term could be reimbursed for the extra expenses involved in providing services for these children. In 1961, $7,705.88 was spent in reimbursing two school districts for regular term expenses incurred during September and October. By the end of the 1961-62 school term, 11 school districts had reported special expenses for serving migrant children enrolled in the regular schools. The total $25,000 appropriation was spent in reimbursing the school districts involved as follows:

School District	Amount of Reimbursement
Rocky Ford, Otero R 2	$ 1,464.93
Hillrose, Morgan 10J	70.68
Granada, Prowers Re-1	49.80
Jaroso, Costilla 8	1,411.04
Ft. Lupton, Weld 8	7,656.08
Kersey, Weld Re-7	71.84
Eaton, Weld 37	4,927.97
Adams City, Adams 14	1,694.61
Ault, Weld 34	5,284.54
Greeley, Weld 6	236.64
Ovid, Sedgwick 35R	2,131.87
	$25,000.00

Cooperative School Attendance Program

Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico are cooperating in an interstate program to develop a standardized interstate school records system for migrant children. In addition to records standardization, the program is aimed at providing better communication among the participating states to provide notification on the movement of migrant families and to encourage rapid enrollment of these youngsters when their families reach a new place of employment. Dr. Potts served as chairman for the program, which had its beginnnings at a three-state conference held in Santa Fe in April, 1959. Texas indicated in 1961 that it would participate in the program.

Continuing Needs

While there have been significant gains in the education of migrant children in Colorado in the past few years, programs are as yet insufficient to meet the needs. Dr. Potts has estimated that at least 15 summer schools are needed. While a more adequate summer school program will assure school attendance for at least six weeks by a much larger number of migratory children, it offers no solution to the problem of regular school attendance. To a considerable degree, regular school attendance for migrant children is a problem which should be solved in the migrants' home base states where they spend the greatest portion of the year at any one time. A majority of migrant families do not come to Colorado at a time when regular schools are in operation.

In considering the problem of regular school attendance it should be remembered that mere attendance is no guarantee of educational benefits. Most of the migrant youngsters in Colorado come from Spanish cultural backgrounds and are bilingual, which usually results in an added handicap -- equal inability in both languages. These youngsters, unless adequately prepared and motivated, usually cannot profit from the normal classroom experience. Such preparation and motivation can be developed through smaller classes taught by teachers with special training. In addition to special training, these teachers should have sympathy with these migrant youngsters, have a great deal of patience, and be able to understand and work with them.

Colorado has taken a major step through the passage of legislation to provide funds for both migrant summer schools and migrant attendance during regular sessions. It is up to local districts where there are large concentrations of migrants to take advantage of these funds.

Considerable emphasis is placed on educational opportunities for migrants, because it is through education that migrant children and young adults have the best opportunity of leaving the migrant stream for permanent semi-skilled and skilled employment. That there has been national recognition of the importance of migrant education is shown by legislation introduced in the last session of Congress to provide federal aid for this purpose. Under the proposed legislation, which passed the Senate but not the House, federal aid would have been provided to state departments of education for three purposes:

1) to expand present summer school programs in states where they exist and to encourage other states to establish such programs;

2) to help offset the additional expense resulting from the attendance of migrant children during regular school terms; and

3) to foster adult education programs.

Welfare

Hospitalization and medical expenses and lack of employment are the major reasons why migrant workers and their families seek emergency welfare assistance. Lack of county welfare funds and the lack of migrant resident status are the major reasons why migrant requests for such assistance are often rejected.

Questionnaires

The State Department of Welfare, in 1960, in cooperation with the Council staff, submitted a questionnaire to the 29 counties thought to have the greatest influx of migrant agricultural labor during the growing and harvest seasons. The 29 county departments of welfare were asked: 1) the amount of financial assistance given migrants for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 (through September 30); 2) the types of financial assistance given; 3) the number of migrant families and individual migrants for whom such assistance was provided; 4) the reasons why assistance was requested; 5) the reasons for rejecting such assistance; 6) other services for migrants provided by the welfare department; and 7) evaluation of present programs and the need for expanded services.

Replies were received from 27 counties, nine of which indicated that either no financial assistance had been provided migrants during the three years or specified that the amount spent was so small that no separate records had been kept. These nine counties included: Conejos, Costilla, El Paso, Fremont, Moffat, Montezuma, Montrose, Otero, and Routt. Montrose County reported that it had requests only from migrants en route to or from the peach harvest in Mesa County, with travel assistance sometimes provided. The Otero County Welfare Department acknowledged the need for welfare assistance but indicated that none had been provided because of lack of welfare funds and the feeling that welfare aid for migrants was a state and national responsibility rather than a local concern.

During the growing seasons of 1961 and 1962, all county welfare departments in the state were asked to record and report to the Legislative Council the number of single and family migrant units who were helped and the type and amount of assistance provided.

Extent of Financial Assistance. Slightly more than $12,500 was spent for aid to migrants by 18 counties in 1958; in 1959, the total was $9,710, and slightly more than $10,300 was expended during the first nine months of 1960. Delta, Huerfano, Mesa, and Weld counties had the largest expenditures for this purpose during the period. In 1958, assistance was provided for 163 families and 48 single migrants; 87 families and 79 single migrants received assistance in 1959, as did 80 families and 109 single migrants during the first nine months of 1960. In 1961, almost $3,700 was reported spent to provide assistance to 27 migrant families and five single migrants.

Medical care (including hospitalization) and food orders comprised the major types of assistance provided migrants during these years. Other types of financial assistance included: transportation, fuel, burial, and rent. In 1961 and 1962, surplus commodities were made available for distribution to migrants, but not all counties took advantage of the program.

Reasons Why Assistance Requested. Fifteen counties reported that medical assistance was a primary reason why welfare aid was requested, and 13 listed unemployment. Some indicated that unemployment resulted because migrants appeared before they were needed, and others stated that at the close of the harvest season some migrants were without employment and had no funds for subsistence or travel. Three counties replied that death of a migrant or some member of his family was a major reason for assistance requests -- usually for burial expenses, food, and rent if the deceased was the major breadwinner. Several counties indicated that many migrants in transit either have a vehicle breakdown or find themselves without funds and so request help.

Reasons Why Assistance is Rejected. Three counties (Baca, Gunnison, Mesa) reported that they very rarely rejected migrant requests for emergency assistance, especially if small children were involved. Five counties indicated that assistance is rejected if employment is available and the migrant is able to work. Assistance is not given in two counties because of residence requirements, and a few counties stated that assistance is not provided if investigation indicates that the family has sufficient financial resources.

Other Services Provided Migrants by County Welfare Department. Assistance in finding employment, referrals to private welfare and service agencies, and referrals to other public agencies comprise the bulk of services other than financial assistance provided for migrants by county welfare departments. Eight counties indicated that they referred migrants to employment agencies or other employment sources, and the same number reported referrals to church groups, Salvation Army, Red Cross, American Legion, and similar organizations.

Organized Approach in Assisting Migrants. Only the Mesa County Welfare Department reported an adequate community-organized approach to assist migrants. The Mesa County Migrant Council coordinates the efforts of public agencies such as welfare and health, private groups, interested citizens, and growers. Several other counties indicated a need for this type of organization.

Evaluation of Assistance Programs. Three counties (Arapahoe, Logan, and Morgan) were of the opinion that the present level of assistance was adequate to meet short-term emergencies. Five counties (Bent, Gunnison, Kiowa, Prowers, and Weld) stressed the value to both migrant families and the community of services and assistance provided. Mesa and Boulder counties commented that present residence requirements restrict proper planning and assistance for migrant families, and several counties stated they were hampered because of lack of funds.

Need for Expanded Services. If state and/or federal funds were provided to assure adequate assistance to migrants under existing programs, there would be no need for expanded services, in the opinion of many of the county departments of welfare answering the questionnaire. Several counties specified a need for services other than welfare. In the San Luis Valley, Alamosa County cited schools and recreation programs, and Rio Grande County recommended the employment of a full-time public health nurse. Two counties (Baca and Kiowa) stated that there was need for greater coordination and exchange of information between the welfare department and state and private employment agencies. Weld and Larimer counties were of the opinion that welfare assistance for medical care and hospitalization should be increased.

THE GROWER: TRENDS, TECHNOLOGY, AND PRODUCTION

There have been some major changes in Colorado's agricultural economy in the past 10 years. Most of these changes are extensions of developments prior to World War II, and all of them have had their impact on growers who raise crops requiring a large supply of seasonal farm labor. The most significant of these include: 1) the decrease in number of farms throughout the state and the increase in the average size of farms in most areas of the state; 2) an increase in the acreage in some crops requiring large amounts of seasonal farm labor; 3) a shift in emphasis among some crops requiring large amounts of seasonal farm labor; 4) the elimination or reduction in the fresh markets for some vegetable crops; 5) mechanization and technical innovation; 6) growth in competing areas in other parts of the country; and 7) patterns of labor utilization.

Number of Farms and Farm Size

The number of farms in the five areas of the state using seasonal farm labor decreased by 21.4 per cent from 1950 to 1960. At the same time, the median size farm in these areas increased by 21.1 per cent. The largest increase in farm size was in the San Juan Basin, where the median size farm was 501 acres in 1950 and 784 acres in 1960. The median farm size decreased in only one area, Northern Colorado. Table 96 lists the five areas of the state using the greatest number of seasonal farm workers, the number of farms in 1950 and 1960 and per cent of change, and the median size farm and per cent of change between 1950 and 1960.

TABLE 96

Number of Farms, Median Size of Farms, and Per Cent Change 1950 to 1960, Selected Areas of Colorado

	No. of Farms		Per Cent of	Median Size (Acres)		Per Cent of
Area	1950	1960	Change	1950	1960	Change
Arkansas Valley	4,283	3,088	-28.0	338	489	+44.7
San Luis Valley	2,718	1,909	-29.8	239	329	+37.6
Western Slope	5,584	4,271	-23.5	52.7	68.1	+29.2
San Juan Basin	1,224	928	-25.2	501	784	+56.5
Northern Colorado	12,385	10,394	-16.1	153	145	- 5.2
State Total	26,194	20,590	-21.4	187.0	226.5	+21.1

Acreage of Major Crops

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet acreage in all of Colorado increased by more than 15 per cent between 1950 and 1961. The biggest increase proportionally was on the Western Slope, but the greatest increase in acres was in Northern Colorado. Table 97 shows the number of acres of sugar beets harvested in 1950 and 1961 for the five areas included in this study and for the state as a whole.

TABLE 97

Sugar Beet Acreage in Colorado, 1950 and 1961

Area	Acres 1950	Acres 1961	Per Cent of Change
Arkansas Valley	16,771	15,943	- 4.9
San Luis Valley	459	136	-70.4
Western Slope	4,619	5,660	+22.5
San Juan Basin	0	0	0
Northern Colorado	117,790	139,313	+18.5
State Total	139,639	161,052	+15.3

Potatoes. Potato acreage for the state as a whole increased by 5.6 per cent between 1950 and 1960, but decreased in all areas of the state, except the San Luis Valley, where acreage increased by 20.6 per cent. Table 98 shows the potato acreage in Colorado by area for 1950 and 1960 and the per cent of change during the 10-year period.

TABLE 98

Potato Acreage in Colorado, 1950 and 1960

Area	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent of Change
Arkansas Valley	470	460	- .02
San Luis Valley	32,230	38,900	+20.6
Western Slope	2,020	720	-64.3
San Juan Basin	420	160	-61.9
Northern Colorado	16,720	14,510	-13.2
State Total	51,860	54,750	+ 5.6

Peaches. Peach production in Colorado is confined almost exclusively to the Western Slope. The number of farms reporting peach production decreased by more than 46 per cent from 1950 to 1960 in Mesa County, while the number of bearing peach trees in that county decreased by 22 per cent during the same period. However, total production was only 3.2 per cent less in 1960, which indicates that production per tree has increased considerably.

Onions. Onion acreage in Colorado declined from 1950 to 1960 by 18.4 per cent. The only area that reported an increase in the number of acres planted in onions was Northern Colorado, where the increase was 3.9 per cent. Table 99 shows the onion acreage for three areas of of Colorado in 1950 and 1960 and the per cent of change in acreage between these two years.

TABLE 99

Onion Acreage in Colorado, Selected Areas, 1950 and 1960

Areas	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent of Change
Arkansas Valley	5,000	3,830	-23.4
Western Slope	1,400	660	-52.8
Northern Colorado	3,270	3,400	+ 3.9
State Total	9,670	7,890	-18.4

Pinto Beans. The use of seasonal farm labor for harvesting pinto beans is confined to the San Juan Basin. Pinto bean acreage in the counties of Dolores and Montezuma increased by 5.9 per cent from 84,550 acres to 89,550 acres from 1950 to 1960.

Broomcorn. Broomcorn is another crop requiring seasonal farm labor which is confined almost entirely to a small area of the state, extreme southeastern Colorado. Broomcorn acreage in Baca and Prowers counties in 1950 amounted to 74,101 acres, while in 1960 the acreage was only 47,020 acres (a decrease of more than 36 per cent).

Lettuce. Lettuce acreage in Colorado shifted considerably between 1950 and 1960. Table 100 shows the lettuce acreage in various counties in the state. Lettuce acreage in four Northern Colorado counties decreased from 1,100 acres in 1950 to only 150 acres in 1960. Acreage in four central Colorado or Arkansas Valley counties decreased from 470 acres to 60 acres. Lettuce acreage in the northwestern counties of Routt and Grand decreased from 1,100 acres in 1950 to 120 acres in 1960. The only area of the state showing an increase in lettuce acreage between 1950 and 1960 was the San Luis Valley, from 4,500 acres to 5,600 acres. The total state acreage for the counties shown in Table 100 decreased from 7,170 acres to 5,930 acres between 1950 and 1960, or 17.3 per cent.

TABLE 100

Lettuce Acreage in Colorado, Selected Counties, 1950 and 1960

County	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent of Change
Adams	700	80	- 88.5
Arapahoe	50	10	- 80.0
Jefferson	100	20	- 80.0
Weld	250	40	- 84.0
Chaffee	100	0	-100.0

TABLE 100
(continued)

County	1950	1960	Per Cent of Change
Fremont	100	10	- 90.0
Prowers	150	0	-100.0
Pueblo	120	50	- 58.3
Alamosa	1,300	800	- 38.4
Conejos	1,000	800	- 20.0
Costilla	500	2,400	+380.0
Mineral	200	0	-100.0
Rio Grande	1,500	700	- 53.3
Saguache	0	900	+100.0
Grand	550	120	- 78.1
Routt	550	0	-100.0
State Total	7,170	5,930	- 17.3

Other Vegetables and Cantaloupes. Acreage planted in cantaloupes and vegetables for fresh market decreased 27.8 per cent between 1950 and 1960. The Arkansas Valley had the largest gain in acreage planted in vegetables and cantaloupes, from 1,820 acres in 1950 to 2,160 acres in 1960. Baca, Bent, and Otero counties each had increases in acreage, while Crowley and Prowers counties reported decreases. Vegetable acreage in the San Luis Valley decreased by almost 50 per cent between 1950 and 1960. The two crops that decreased most sharply were cauliflower and green peas, while spinach showed a marked increase. The Western Slope counties of Delta, Mesa, and Montrose had very little change in fresh market vegetables and cantaloupe acreage between 1950 and 1960.

Montezuma County in the San Juan Basin reported 90 acres of commercial vegetables and cantaloupes in 1960 as compared with no acreage in 1950. The Northern Colorado area, as a whole, showed a 20.8 per cent decrease in acreage for fresh market vegetables and cantaloupes between 1950 and 1960. Adams and Weld counties reported the largest acreage decrease, while Boulder and Larimer counties each reported slight increases. Cabbage for the fresh market was the crop with the largest loss in acreage, but green peas, tomatoes, and celery each had considerable acreage decreases. Table 101 shows the acreage harvested in fresh market vegetables and cantaloupes for the five areas of Colorado in 1950 and 1960.

TABLE 101

Other Vegetables and Cantaloupes Acreage in Colorado (Fresh Market), 1950 and 1960

Area	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent of Change
Arkansas Valley	1,820	2,160	+ 18.7
San Luis Valley	7,500	3,820	- 49.0
Western Slope	500	510	+ 2.0
San Juan Basin	0	90	+100.0
Northern Colorado	7,330	5,800	- 20.8
State Total	17,150	12,380	- 27.8

In addition to the vegetables grown for fresh market (snap beans, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, celery, sweet corn, green peas, spinach and tomatoes), some are also grown for processing. Those grown for processing include snap beans, cabbage, cucumbers, green peas, and tomatoes. The state-wide totals (county or area totals not available) show a decrease in acreage planted in the vegetables for processing between 1950 and 1960. The following table shows the crops grown for processing for which acreage information was available.

Crop	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent of Change
Snap Beans	1,300	1,700	+308.7
Cucumbers	2,270	1,200	- 47.2
Tomatoes	3,000	2,400	- 20.0

Other Fruits. Other fruits which have played an important part in the demand for seasonal farm labor include primarily apples, pears, and cherries. These fruits are grown primarily in Delta and Mesa counties on the Western Slope, Larimer County in Northern Colorado, in Garfield and Fremont counties, and Montezuma County in the San Juan Basin. The yearly production in 1950 and 1960 for cherries, apples, and pears is shown in Table 102. There was a greatly reduced number of bearing trees in all of these fruits between 1950 and 1960. Apple and cherry production declined slightly, but pear production increased from 1950 to 1960.

TABLE 102

Production of Apples, Cherries, and Pears, and Number of Bearing Trees by County, 1950 and 1960

County	Apples (bushels)		No. of Bearing Trees	
	1950	1960	1950	1960
Delta	983,635	533,004	215,534	177,527
Mesa	24,552	50,926	13,885	19,414
Montezuma	62,634	77,512	50,753	34,537
Montrose	49,599	45,853	22,414	16,267
Garfield	47,449	21,812	17,548	10,801
Fremont	140,447	11,543	51,989	14,119
Larimer	25,562	10,874	20,444	4,274
State Total[a]	1,397,747	764,803	450,744	288,237
	Cherries (pounds)			
Larimer	27,248,500	1,274,717	154,679	48,805
Delta	10,974,900	718,025	16,291	29,267
Garfield	1,729,800	131,823	4,515	2,118
Mesa	5,796,100	481,451	14,996	10,952
Fremont	3,415,900	22,760	20,429	3,564
State Total[a]	53,362,700	2,840,491	248,827	100,718
	Pears (bushels)			
Delta	16,781	52,769	10,636	19,104
Mesa	143,335	138,536	59,654	41,394
State Total[a]	165,795	195,437	74,550	62,937

---

a. State total exceeds sum of individual counties shown because of production in other parts of the state not shown.

Production

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet yield per acre on a state-wide basis has increased considerably over the past 15 years. In 1946, the state-wide average yield per acre was 12.5 tons. By 1961, the state-wide average was 14.7 tons per acre, and the five-year (1956-1960) average yield per acre on a state-wide basis was 17.0 tons. Table 103 shows the yield per acre by area for 1946 and 1961 and the 1956-60 five-year average.

TABLE 103

Sugar Beet Yield Per Acre For Selected Years in Colorado

Area	Tons Per Acre 1946	 1961	 5-Year Average (1956-60)
Arkansas Valley	11.2	12.3	15.2
San Luis Valley	5.9	9.1	7.7
Western Slope	11.5	20.5	17.6
Northern Colorado	13.9	14.9	17.3
State Total	12.5	14.7	17.0

Total state sugar beet production in 1946 was 1,920,000 tons and the 1961 total state production was 2,456,000, an increase of 27.9 per cent.

Potatoes. Potato yields per acre varied considerably from year to year between 1946 and 1961, as did the number of acres planted. Table 104 shows the number of acres of potatoes harvested, the yield per acre in hundred weights, and total state production from 1946 to 1961. Average yield per acre from 1946 to 1961 in Colorado was 192 hundred weight.

TABLE 104

Colorado Potato Acreage, Yield Per Acre, and Total Production, 1946-61

Year	Acres Harvested	Yield Per Acre (Cwt)	Total State Production (1000 Cwt)	Per Cent of Total U.S. Production
1946	83,000	141	11,703	4.00
1947	66,000	160	10,494	4.49
1948	72,000	174	12,528	4.64
1949	59,000	194	11,434	4.74
1950	56,000	195	10,920	5.81
1951	45,000	153	6,885	4.85
1952	50,000	231	11,530	5.46
1953	57,000	201	11,481	4.95
1954	54,000	197	10,620	4.83
1955	52,000	175	9,120	4.00
1956	53,000	192	10,197	4.15
1957	56,000	194	10,857	4.47
1958	59,000	229	13,505	5.06
1959	57,000	206	11,760	4.78
1960	56,000	213	11,922	4.63
1961	60,000	218	13,097	4.50

Onions. Yields per acre for onions varied from 175 hundred weight to 290 hundred weight between 1946 and 1961. Acreage harvested varied from a low of 5,500 acres in 1952 to a high of 13,500 acres in 1946. The average yield per acre between 1946 and 1961 was 250 hundred weight. Table 105 shows the number of acres of onions harvested, the state-wide yield per acre, and total state production from 1946 to 1961.

TABLE 105

Colorado Onion Acreage, Yield Per Acre, and Total Production, 1946-61

Year	Acres Harvested	Yield Per Acre (Cwt)	Total State Production (1000 Cwt)
1946	13,500	245	3,650
1947	11,000	220	2,420
1948	11,000	225	2,750
1949	11,300	225	2,830
1950	11,000	205	2,260
1951	8,800	175	1,540
1952	5,500	262	1,441
1953	5,900	250	1,475
1954	5,900	250	1,475
1955	6,000	270	1,620
1956	6,700	280	1,876
1957	7,300	280	2,044
1958	7,800	280	2,184
1959	8,200	280	2,296
1960	8,700	290	2,523
1961	8,600	270	2,322

Technological Changes and Mechanization

Technological changes and mechanization have altered substantially the demand for seasonal farm labor in Colorado. The biggest, single change in the demand for seasonal labor has occurred in sugar beet production.

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet harvest has become 100 per cent mechanized during the past 20 years. Prior to World War II, a large number of seasonal farm workers were needed to perform the topping, piling, and loading operations connected with harvesting sugar beets. The great number of workers available throughout the nation prior to World War II tended to retard mechanization of harvest activities.

The labor shortages resulting from World War II provided the impetus for new attempts at developing satisfactory machinery to perform the relatively difficult tasks of beet topping and loading. Farm machinery manufacturers produced several machines and from these early models have evolved the fast, efficient, and economical harvesting machines which now have replaced all hand labor in the sugar beet harvest process.

The mechanization achieved so successfully in sugar beet harvest has not spread to any great extent to sugar beet pre-harvest in Colorado. Very few farmers have mechanized pre-harvest work to the point where no labor is needed. There have been some changes, however, which have greatly reduced the need for seasonal farm labor in these activities.

The development of monogerm seed has probably been the most important cause of reduced labor needs in sugar beets pre-harvest. Monogerm seed has permitted the introduction and use of blocking and thinning machines, which have been utilized with varying degrees of success in some areas of the state. The introduction of monogerm seed also allowed the use of long handled hoes in blocking, thinning, and weeding operations to a far greater extent than was possible when segmented beet seed was planted.

The Northern Colorado area is not only the major sugar beet producing area of the state, but also has more of its acreage planted in monogerm seed than any other area. In 1962, from 80 to 100 per cent of the sugar beet acreage in Northern Colorado was planted with monogerm seed. In some areas of Northern Colorado, 80 per cent of the acreage had some blocking and thinning done by machines. The mechanization of pre-harvest activities in Northern Colorado is proceeding much more rapidly than did the mechanization of harvest activities in the same area, according to some reports from sugar company officials.

In contrast to Northern Colorado, Arkansas Valley farmers planted only about 50 per cent of their acreage with monogerm seed in 1961. Few farmers in the Arkansas Valley have taken advantage of the blocking and thinning machines now available, even for use on the acres planted with the monogerm seed. The most common method of blocking and thinning sugar beets in the Arkansas Valley is still the use of short handled hoes. The continued use of segmented seed and the continued use of short handled hoes has not led to an appreciable reduction in the demand for seasonal farm labor for sugar beet pre-harvest.

Monogerm seed is not planted on the Western Slope because it is not as disease resistant as segmented seed. Little, if any, mechanical blocking and thinning is performed. This activity is usually still performed with short handled hoes. Hand labor requirements have remained relatively stable on the Western Slope for the pre-harvest activities in sugar beets for several years.

Another process which has led to a decrease in the demand for labor in sugar beet pre-harvest activities is the application of chemical sprays, dusts, and coatings. These chemical applications have had varying degrees of success, depending on soil and climatic condition and on plant size and growth at the time applied. No chemical application has proved entirely effective under all conditions, but research is continuing in the development of a substance which will prove generally effective for weed control. Development and use of such a substance could effectively decrease the need for seasonal farm labor in sugar beet pre-harvest work.

Potatoes. Mechanization in potato harvest is not as far advanced in Colorado as in other large potato producing states such as Idaho and North Dakota, although some farmers have had their harvest processes mechanized for several years. Machines developed on an experimental basis during the past two years indicate that mechanical harvesting may be possible under the most difficult conditions found in Colorado.

Northern Colorado growers reported that approximately 25 per cent of the 1962 potato crop was mechanically harvested. Growers in the San Luis Valley, the largest potato growing area in the state, reported that only 15 to 20 per cent of the potato crop was harvested mechanically in 1961. Complete mechanical harvesting consists of machine digging, picking, loading, and unloading of the potatoes. The activities involved in sorting, grading, cleaning, and packing for shipment are not considered as part of the harvest activity proper.

Fruits. Some mechanization of fruit pre-harvest and harvest activities has occurred within the last few years in Colorado. The main mechanization has taken place in cherry harvest on the Western Slope. A canning company spokesman in 1961 reported that the use of two mechanical pickers had reduced the need for cherry pickers by one half. This company plans to mechanize its cherry picking process completely within the next two years.

Mechanization of pre-harvest activities in fruit can be effected in two ways: 1) by the use of chemical sprays while the trees are in bloom; or 2) by the use of mechanical shakers to reduce the number of blossoms on a tree. Both methods result in less fruit per tree and are employed to produce a larger, more select fruit at harvest time. Hand labor must now be used to thin the fruit, if mechanical processes are not used or are not successful.

The use of machine picking in fruit has been confined almost solely to cherries, although machines for picking peaches and apples have been developed and used successfully in other states.

California fruit growers began to mechanize their fruit harvest even before the labor unionization attempt in 1960, and they have intensified their efforts since to perfect a picker that works equally well on all fruits. Several different machines have been developed in California that are used in picking peaches, although all pickers consist of two basic parts. One part is the shaking unit, which shakes the branches or trunk of the tree and causes the ripe fruit to fall on the catching platform, the second part of the mechanical pickers. The catching platform is a canvas or rubber covered frame which catches the falling fruit and channels it into boxes or bins, either by gravity flow or through an arrangement of belts and conveyors.

Initial reports in California revealed much less tree damage than had been expected from using the mechanical pickers in peaches. In addition to reducing over-all picking costs substantially, growers also reported a tremendous decrease in the need for labor. Some growers reported that one machine with a crew of five to seven men replaced a hand picking crew of 60-80 workers.

Vegetables. Mechanical harvesting of vegetables in Colorado has progressed rapidly in some cases and hardly at all in others. The harvest for processing of beets, sweet corn, and green peas has been successfully mechanized. Similar operations for other vegetables have not been completely mechanized. Root crops such as onions and carrots continue to be hand harvested, although there is evidence that some growers in Northern Colorado have been able to mechanize their onion harvest with great savings in labor costs.

The mechanical harvesting of snap beans, especially for processing, has increased greatly in the past two years in Northern Colorado. Some growers who previously used a combination of mechanical picking (first time over) and hand picking (second time over) have changed to complete mechanical picking with the development of more efficient machines.

Mechanical harvesting of tomatoes and cucumbers is still only in the planning stage, so far as Colorado growers are concerned. One of the big drawbacks to the mechanization of these two crops in Colorado is the absence of suitable varieties of the crops to plant. Little research is being done in Colorado to develop strains of these plants which can be adapted to machine harvesting, although considerable progress has been achieved along these lines in other states, notably California and Michigan. The prime requirement for machine harvesting of tomatoes and cucumbers is the development of a strain which ripens uniformly. Machines to pick tomatoes and cucumbers are not a problem, as they have been produced and are being used successfully in other states.

Lettuce, cabbage, cauliflower, spinach, and celery harvest activities are still performed by hand labor in Colorado, so far as can be determined. The use of machines to cut lettuce and cabbage is well advanced in some other states. The relatively small amount of these vegetables grown in Colorado may be a main reason for the seeming failure to attempt mechanical harvesting; another important factor is the lack of research. Colorado growers do not have the same advantages as growers in other areas (such as California, Arizona, and the Rio Grande Valley) in this respect. In those states with large acreages and long growing seasons, much research is performed free of charge by manufacturers of chemicals and farm machinery.

Grower Attitudes Toward Mechanization and Other Matters

Many of the growers of crops using seasonal farm labor, especially those for whose crops there are no predetermined contract prices or marketing orders, feel that they have little or no control over market conditions or the prices they receive for their products, while at the same time they have no control over increased costs. Under such circumstances, there is a reluctance to increase seasonal farm labor wages or to increase costs through improvements in or additions to fringe benefits, such as, housing, medical programs, etc. This attitude also extends in some instances to mechanization. Initial investment is costly, and long run benefits may be considered dubious.

Some growers interviewed indicated that even if mechanization might be advantageous in the long run, it was not necessary, as long as a sufficient supply of labor is assured. These attitudes, as well as tradition and the availability of efficient machinery and appropriate crop strains, have a bearing on the rate of mechanization and technological innovation.

Other growers stated that mechanization was probably one solution to their problems and that eventually it would take place. In other words, they felt it might be a choice of mechanizing or going out of business. In a number of cases, it was the grower who indicated he would not stay in business if the bracero program was terminated who also gave a number of reasons why mechanization of his particular crop activities was not practical.

Attitudes Toward Seasonal Farm Labor. There were two distinct points of view expressed by the growers interviewed as to the adequacy of local and domestic workers. Some growers complained that local and domestic workers had proved to be undependable when available and that the supply was decreasing. For this reason, Mexican nationals are necessary. A number of the growers expressing this point of view said that they would prefer to employ local and domestic workers and did so whenever possible.

Other growers had few, if any, complaints about local and domestic labor. Usually these growers did not use braceros, and if they did, it was only in late season crops when the domestics had returned to their home states.

A few growers expressed the opinion that it might be desirable to place domestic workers under a formal arrangement with guarantees to both growers and workers. Other growers thought such a plan would be impractical and that it would be infringing on the rights of domestic workers to change their employment as they saw fit. Some growers expressed a reluctance to become involved in a contractual arrangement with domestic workers which involved families rather than solo work crews.

These attitudes varied according to area and type of crop and also among growers in the same area with similar crop activities. Naturally, the assurance of a dependable labor supply is a prime consideration of growers. Many of them, however, have been concerned with the well-being and social conditions of migrant families and have assisted migrants, either on an individual basis or by participating in organized programs. A considerable number of the growers interviewed expressed a desire to improve the economic and social conditions of domestic migrants but were limited by their financial ability.

Cultural Differences. A major barrier to better relationships between growers and workers is caused by cultural differences. Language is cited usually as the major reason why there is misunderstanding between growers and workers. While it is a formidable barrier in many respects to proper understanding, it is not the only one. Both Spanish-American and Navajo workers come from cultures which are very different from that of the Anglo. Things that are important in these cultures may not be important to the Anglo culture, and vice versa.

It is only natural that the grower's cultural background shapes his view of the Spanish American and the Navajo and that he judges them by his own standards. The inability or reluctance of many Spanish Americans and Navajo to speak English adds to the difficulty. Consequently, the growers may decide that these workers are undependable and that they and their families have no appreciation of good treatment, including such things as adequate housing. It is easy in such circumstances to extend the transgressions of individuals to include an entire ethnic group.

Spanish-American and Navajo seasonal farm workers have been slow to assimilate Anglo culture, although such assimilation appears on the increase as evidenced by the educational attainments most of the workers interviewed indicated that they wanted for their children. It is not likely that there will ever be a very high level of cultural assimilation by non-Anglo seasonal farm workers, because those who are able to adapt more successfully to Anglo society, despite a number of formidable barriers, either never enter the migrant stream or do not remain in it for long. Consequently, the misunderstandings and frictions caused by cultural differences may be expected to continue. In some instances, they may be minimized by continued relationships between growers and workers; in others, there may be no improvement.

LEGISLATION IN OTHER STATES RELATING TO MIGRANTS

Legislation relating to seasonal agricultural workers has been adopted in a number of states. This legislation includes the following subjects: minimum wages, wage payment and collection, workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, regulation of labor contractors and crew leaders, employment of children, housing and labor camps, migrant education, and migrant commissions. This legislation is summarized in this chapter with emphasis given to those subjects which may be of the most interest to Colorado.

Minimum Wage Legislation[1]

Only the minimum wage laws of Hawaii and Puerto Rico apply specifically to agricultural workers. In these two jurisdictions, specific wage rates are set for farm workers and these apply to men, women, and minors. The Hawaii statute sets the minimum wage for agricultural workers at $1.00 an hour and covers agricultural work in any work week in which an employer has 20 or more employees. In Puerto Rico, the statutory rates vary from $.25 per hour to $5.50 per day for different kinds of agricultural work.

Eight other laws are broad enough to cover agriculture: those of California, the District of Columbia, Kansas, Oregon, Utah, Washington,[2] and Wisconsin. These laws apply to women and minors only. They do not set minimum-wage rates in the law, but provide for setting such rates by administrative order. Of these eight, two have issued orders applying specifically to agriculture. A 1960 Wisconsin order established a minimum of $.75 per hour for employment of women and minors 16 years of age and over employed in agriculture; minors under 16 may not be paid less than $.65 an hour. This order also established different specified rates if board and lodging are furnished. Two 1961 California wage orders established a minimum wage of $1.00 an hour for women and minors in packing sheds or farms and for women and minors 16 and over in other agricultural occupations.

Wage Payment and Wage Collection[3]

In California and Massachusetts, wage payment laws expressly apply to farm workers, while a provision in the Minnesota law applies to certain migratory workers. The Pennsylvania law has been interpreted as applying to all farm workers.

---

1. Status of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington 25, D.C., February, 1962, p.3.
2. A second minimum-wage law in Washington, passed in 1959, applying to men, women, and minors, and setting a minimum-wage rate of $1.00 an hour, excludes agriculture from coverage.
3. Status of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws, op.cit., p.4.

The California law requires the payment of wages to be at least semi-monthly, except that agricultural employees who are boarded and lodged by employers may be paid monthly. In Massachusetts agricultural workers must be paid at least monthly.

The Minnesota wage payment law requires regular paydays -- at intervals of not more than 15 days -- for "transient" workers. This has been interpreted by the attorney general to apply to migratory workers who are employed on any project of a transitory nature.

Amendments to the New York law concerning labor contractors require migratory field labor contractors, crew leaders, and other persons bringing in five or more migratory workers to keep records of wages and hours of the workers and to give each worker a statement of wages and withholdings at the time of payment. In some of the other states the general wage payment laws are sufficiently broad to apply to farm employees.

As to wage collection, the laws of 16 jurisdictions (Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin), authorizing the labor department to use legal procedures to collect back wages for workers, are broad enough to cover the claims of farm workers.

Workmen's Compensation[4]

Seventeen states and Puerto Rico have some specific coverage of agricultural workers. Only 10 of these(Alaska, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Ohio, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico) cover farm workers in the same manner as other workers. Eight of these laws are compulsory, while the Vermont law is elective, under which workers are covered unless the employer elects not to come under the act. The Wisconsin law was amended in 1961 to provide compulsory coverage for farmers who employ six or more workers for 20 days during a calendar year in one or more locations; these provisions become applicable 10 days after the 20th such day.

The New Jersey workmen's compensation law, which is elective, is sufficiently broad to apply to farm workers, but it expressly provides that farmers are not required to carry insurance.

In the other eight states (Arizona, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming) agricultural workers engaged in specific farm occupations, usually those involved in the operation of machinery, are covered. Of these, the laws of Arizona, Minnesota, New York, and Oklahoma are compulsory; and those of Kentucky, Louisiana, South Dakota, and Wyoming are elective. In Kentucky and Wyoming the employer must elect by filing a written notice; in Louisiana and South Dakota, the law applies unless the employer specifically rejects it. The Louisiana law excludes from coverage agricultural employees while they are being transported to or from work regardless of the means of conveyance, and members of crews in airplanes in dusting or spraying operations.

---

4. Ibid., p.2.

All but four of the laws that do not specify either compulsory or elective coverage permit farmers, if they wish, to insure voluntarily. Such voluntary coverage is distinguished from elective coverage in that the employer does not lose his common law defenses if he does not choose the voluntary coverage. The laws of Alabama and the District of Columbia expressly prohibit voluntary coverage of farm workers, while the Tennessee and Texas laws are silent on this subject. Delaware formerly prohibited such coverage, but a 1960 law specifically authorized employers of farm labor to accept the act by carrying insurance to cover any necessary benefits. Iowa, which formerly permitted voluntary coverage of agricultural workers only in certain cases, provided in 19[illegible] for such coverage of all farm workers.

Unemployment Insurance[5]

Only the unemployment insurance law of Hawaii provides coverage for agricultural labor--if performed for an employer who has 20 or more employees for 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar years. Puerto Rico also has a program which covers agricultural workers in the sugar industry; this coverage is separate from the program for nonagricultural employment. All the other laws exclude agricultural labor except that of the District of Columbia, which is primarily an urban community. The laws of all but three states (Alabama, Massachusetts, and New York) permit voluntary coverage of excluded occupations, subject to approval by the state agency, but this option has had extensive use only in North Dakota. A significant number of North Dakota farmers have elected coverage even though the law contains a provision requiring a much higher contribution rate for services covered by election.

Crew Leaders and Contractors[6]

Nine states and Puerto Rico have laws or regulations applying specifically to farm labor contractors.

Six of these laws--those of California, Nevada, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Texas, and Washington--expressly cover labor contractors who recruit farm workers for a fee. Under these laws the contractors are required to obtain licenses, to comply with certain requirements as to records, to refrain from engaging in certain undesirable practices, and, usually, to file a bond.

New York does not require farm labor contractors to obtain licenses, but does require them, as well as crew leaders and all persons bringing five or more migrant workers into the state, to register with the Industrial Commission. Employers are prohibited from using the services of labor contractors or crew leaders who are not registered. The commissioner may revoke, suspend, or refuse to renew the registration for various reasons, including violation of the labor or penal laws or giving false information to workers as to terms, conditions, or existence

---

5. *Ibid.*, p.7.
6. *Ibid.*, p.5.

of employment. The law also requires all those registering to keep records and to submit data on wages, housing, and working conditions. This data must also be given to the workers.

A 1961 New Jersey law requires annual registration of day-haul crew leaders. This state also has a regulation requiring farm labor contractors and crew leaders to get annual certificates of registration. Pennsylvania regulations require registration of, and place certain duties and responsibilities upon, crew leaders who "directly or indirectly" recruit migratory workers.

Child Labor in Agriculture[7]

Only nine states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia expressly provide a minimum age for employment of children in agriculture outside of school hours. This age is 14 in Connecticut (applicable to an employer in any week in which he has an average of more than 15 employees), Alaska, Hawaii, Missouri, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In New York, the minimum age is 14, except that children of 12 may assist in the hand harvest of berries, fruits, and vegetables under certain conditions when school is not in session. In New Jersey, the minimum age is 12, and in California, it is 12 during vacations and, 14 outside of school hours on school days. In Utah, the minimum age is 10. In Wisconsin, an Industrial Commission order effective June 1, 1960, established a minimum age of 12 for work in cherry orchards and other specified agricultural employment.

A minimum age for agricultural work during school hours is established by statute in 15 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. This age is 16 in Florida, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Virginia, and Puerto Rico. Under certain conditions, the 16-year minimum age may be waived in Florida and Puerto Rico. In Hawaii, the minimum age is 16 when a child is "required" to attend school, otherwise 14. In California and Pennsylvania, the minimum is 15, except 14 under certain conditions. In Connecticut, Massachusetts, Missouri, Utah, and the District of Columbia, the minimum is 14, and, in Wisconsin, it is 12.

Compulsory school-attendance laws supplement the standards set under the child-labor laws by requiring boys and girls to attend school to a certain age, usually to 16. In many states, however, these laws permit children under 16, or even under 14, to be excused from school to work in agriculture.

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p.1.

Farm Labor Camps

The following 25 states have mandatory laws or regulations that apply to all labor camps or specifically to camps for migrant agricultural workers:

Arizona
California
Connecticut
Delaware
Florida
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Iowa
Maryland
Massachusetts
Minnesota
Montana
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
Ohio
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

These provisions range from very limited regulation in a few states to comprehensive regulation in others. They usually include requirements as to sanitation, housing, location, and construction of the camp. In addition, Michigan has a mandatory regulation for those growers obtaining workers through the Michigan Employment Security Commission, and, in North Carolina, mandatory standards have been adopted by five counties. Advisory camp regulations are in effect in four other states: Indiana, North Dakota, Utah, and Virginia.[8]

Camps Covered[9]

Almost half of the mandatory codes (those of Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming) cover all camps, regardless of the number of occupants. Most of the others exempt camps housing less than three, five, or six workers; in a few states, however, these smaller camps are required to conform to some, but not all, of the specific standards set in the code.

Florida exempts camps housing less than 15 persons, including children, while in Washington the code is applicable to camps housing, or capable of housing, 10 or more workers. The Nevada code specifically exempts "facilities or premises assigned to an employee for his exclusive use or convenience." Thus, in that state, there are no standards applicable to housing assigned to an individual migrant agricultural family.

License Requirements[10]

Eight states (Delaware, Florida, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin) require a license to operate a camp. All of these states provide for annual licensing prior to camp operation, and with the exception of Delaware, specify that the license is revocable. In general, these states, either specifically or by implication, require the administrative agency to inspect the camp prior to issuing the license. Delaware and Maryland specify that the license is not transferrable, and Ohio requires that it be posted.

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p.6.

[9] *Housing for Migrant Agricultural Workers*, Bulletin 235, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards, November, 1961, p.4.

[10] *Ibid.*

California, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, although not requiring a license to operate a camp, do provide for camp registration. In New Jersey, the camp operator or manager must register each camp before its opening or reopening and must maintain a register of all camp occupants. The code requires the administrative agency to issue a "Certificate of Compliance" to approved camps. In Massachusetts, local boards of health are "requested" to maintain a register of camp operators and to distribute the camp standards to each operator in their area. California, which is one of the first states to regulate labor camps, enacted a law effective September 15, 1961 requiring the annual registration of all labor camps.

In Nevada, the code requires the issuance of a permit indicating compliance with camp standards, while in Montana and New Hampshire, the administrative agency must receive prior notification of camp operation.

Ten of the states (Arizona, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Idaho, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, West Virginia, and Wyoming) do not have any licensing, registration, or special notification provision in their codes.

Compliance and Penalty[11]

In approximately two-thirds of the states, the codes provide that the owner, operator, or some other person in charge of camp operations is responsible for compliance with the camp standards. Most of the states also specifically make the camp owner or operator responsible for one or more of the following: sanitary conditions of the camp, inspection of the grounds, or maintaining sanitary and other facilities in good repair. In Pennsylvania, crew leaders are held jointly responsible with camp owners for the maintenance of camp sanitation and cleanliness.[12]

Every state provides penalties for violation, in the form of fines and/or imprisonment. These vary considerably. The lowest is a \$10 fine. Some states establish a fine of up to \$200 and/or imprisonment up to 60 days. Others provide for a fine of up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to one year. A few states specify that each violation is a separate offense.

In general, the penalty applies to the owner or operator of the camp. However, in a number of states it applies to "any person" violating the law or regulation. Thus in these states it would be possible to penalize camp occupants, as well as camp owners or operators, although only Oregon specifically provides that the wilful misuse, damage, or destruction of any facility by any person housed in the camp is a misdemeanor.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, p.5.

[12] Under the "Special Requirements for Crew Leaders," issued as a supplement to the migratory farm labor camp regulations.

In addition to prescribing fines or imprisonment for violation of the codes, nine states--California, Florida, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin--make some provision for the removal of anything injurious to the health of the occupants which has been designated a "nuisance" by the administrative agency, or for the closing down of part or all of the camp, or for both. The New York code requires specific steps to be taken "in order to adequately place and care for workers and their families" housed in camps which are to be closed down.

Administrative Agency[13]

The migrant labor camp codes are administered by either the health or labor department or both. In 18 states (Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming), administration of the camp codes is almost exclusively a responsibility of the state health department. In some of these states, while the regulations are statewide in application, enforcement is a responsibility of the local health agencies. In two states, Ohio and Wisconsin, camp buildings must meet requirements established by the labor department.

In three additional states (Connecticut, New York, and Oregon), although camp codes are administered by the health department, some of the responsibility is shared by another governmental agency. In Connecticut, the department of agriculture is authorized to establish standards for living quarters furnished migratory farm laborers. In New York, the labor department has specific authority to enter and inspect all labor camps; while in Oregon, the bureau of labor and the state employment service are authorized, subject to final review by the health authorities, to close a camp facility that violates the health code.

The state labor department administers the camp code in California, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. In Pennsylvania, the code requires the Department of Labor and Industry to have a satisfactory report of a preliminary sanitary inspection of the camp by the health department before it issues a license for the operation of a camp.

---

[13] Housing for Migrant Agricultural Workers, op.cit., p.6.

Education

At least eight states have taken steps to provide special educational opportunities for migrant children. These states are California, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. Little information is available concerning these special programs.

New York had nine summer schools for migrants during 1961. These schools were all sponsored by local school districts, which were reimbursed by the state for their expenses, with a total of $40,000 being spent for this purpose.

Ohio operated seven schools for migrant children in the summer of 1960. These schools were sponsored by the local school districts, which were reimbursed from state funds. No information is available as to total costs of the Ohio program.

Migratory Labor Committees

Some 28 states have state migratory labor committees. The committees take different forms: some of them are interagency in character; others are combinations of government officials and laymen. Programs with which they are concerned cover all aspects of conditions affecting migratory workers and their families--housing, wages, transportation, schools, employment of children, child-care centers, health and sanitation, rest stops, and other measures which contribute to standards of living of permanent residents. The basic philosophy of the committees is that they can be more effective through a coordinate and united approach and that the combined strength of the group is more than the individual parts. The committees act administratively within the framework of the agencies represented as well as make recommendations for legislative action.

The states with migratory labor committees are: Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Seven of the committees were formed before 1954, 14 between 1954 and 1958, and the remaining seven since 1958.

Composition of Committees. So far as is known, eight committees consist of state agency representatives only: Florida (plus one member of House of Representatives), Idaho, Michigan, New York, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, and Washington. The most common state agencies with representatives serving as chairmen of migratory labor committees were employment departments (7), labor departments (7), and agriculture departments (3). Only Arizona and New Jersey provide that the chairman shall be from a growers' organization.

At least 10 committees have representatives from state agencies plus representatives from workers, growers, and lay groups: Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. Organized labor is represented in five committees: Delaware, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota.

Functions of Committees

Arizona. The Governor's Advisory Committee on Seasonal Farm Labor was established in 1956 and is appointed by the governor. It has no separate budget. Its primary function is to advise and assist the governor on migratory labor problems in the development of a long-range program to enhance the contribution of the migrant workers to the state and to help the migrant worker help himself further his own well-being.

Delaware. The Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor was created in 1957 and is appointed by the governor. It has no separate budget. It was established to study the problems of the migrants and to make reports and recommendations to the governor from time to time.

Florida. The Committee on Migrant Agricultural Labor was established in 1957 and is appointed by the governor. The member state agencies share in the cost of supporting the committee. The committee is charged with the responsibility of studying the migrant problems of the state, improving the services of the state to migrants under present laws, effecting a better liaison between the state agencies in working to improve services to migrants, and recommending legislative action.

Idaho. The Migratory Labor Committee was established in 1956 and is appointed by the governor. The various committee members assume whatever costs are involved. The purpose of the committee is to: 1) improve the health, education, housing and transportation of migrants; and 2) encourage civic and municipal agencies and the public to welcome the migrants and make them feel that they are a part of the community, thereby encouraging them to assume their responsibilities.

Illinois. The Committee on Agricultural Migrant Workers of the Illinois Commission on Children was established in 1955 and is a subcommittee of that commission. Financing is provided through the commission's budget. The purpose of the committee is stated to be fact finding, public education, and stimulation of existing organizations to action.

Michigan. The Michigan Inter-Agency Committee on Migratory Labor was set up in 1952 and is appointed by the governor. The member agencies support committee activities. The functions of the committee are to: 1) make a contribution to the solution of migrant problems; 2) study the problems of migratory labor and recommend to the governor such corrective measures as are needed including legislation; 3) serve as a major source of information; and 4) give assistance to the Study Commission on Migratory Labor appointed by the governor.

Minnesota. The Minnesota Farm and Migratory Labor Advisory Committee was created in 1956, and all members are appointed by the governor. The committee is financed from funds available to the Farm Placement Service in the Department of Employment Security. The purpose of the committee is to advise the Department of Employment Security on Farm Placement program matters relating to the needs of employers and farm workers. The subject about which most discussion and advice centers is the welfare of the migrant worker and his children.

New Jersey. The New Jersey Migrant Labor Bureau is a state agency within the Department of Labor and was established by an act of the legislature in 1945. The Bureau receives a general fund appropriation for its activities. The bureau's functions are outlined by statute as follows:[14]

> (a) Enforce the provisions of article two of this act either directly or through interdepartmental agreements;
>
> (b) Enforce all other applicable labor laws, including, but not limited to, those relating to private employment agencies, child labor, wage payments and wage claims, with respect to migrant labor camps;
>
> (c) Provide inspectional services to encourage minimum standards of housing and sanitation in migrant labor camps;
>
> (d) Advise and consult with employers of migrant labor as to the ways and means of improving living conditions of migrant workers;
>
> (e) In co-operation with the Department of Health, prescribe minimum standards of sanitation, and preventive and curative health services, not inconsistent with this act, for migrant workers;
>
> (f) In co-operation with the Department of Education, provide, so far as possible, educational facilities for the children of migrant workers;
>
> (g) In co-operation with the Department of State Police, provide for a minimum standard of protection for migrant workers;
>
> (h) In co-operation with the Department of Economic Development, plan, locate and construct (as soon as conditions permit) experimental State camps for migrant workers; provided, however, that no such camp shall be located or constructed in any municipality where there is not located an industry or farm employing migrant labor without the consent of the governing body of said municipality;
>
> (i) In co-operation with the Department of Agriculture, conduct an educational program for employees of migrant labor pertaining to the standards, methods and objectives of the Bureau of Migrant Labor;

---

14. Migrant Labor Act, Chapter 71, Public Law, 1945.

(j) In co-operation with the Department of Institutions and Agencies, help devise ways and means for resolving the welfare problems that require attention.

New York. The New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Farm and Food Processing Labor was created in 1943, and members are appointed by the governor. The committee's operating expenses are provided in the Agriculture and Markets Department budget. The responsibility of the committee is chiefly to improve the effectiveness of the work of each of the state agencies through joint planning and mutual evaluation of each program and problem. Each member agency has specific responsibilities - information, education, regulation, service - that are in the public interest.

North Carolina. The North Carolina Committee on Migratory Labor was created in 1954, and all appointments are made by the governor. The committee has no separate budget, but the member state agencies share in the expenses. The purpose of the committee is to make available to the agricultural migrants passing through the state the services provided by the various state and local agencies and to develop standards which will result in better living conditions for the migrants, thereby improving the level of living of the total population.

North Dakota. The Governor's Migratory Farm Labor Committee was created in 1958 and is appointed by the governor. The member state agencies share the expenses of the committee. The stated function of the committee is to work with the Potato Growers' and Beet Growers' Associations in studies relating to housing, health, law enforcement, welfare, education, labor supply, and integration into community life.

Ohio. The Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor was established in 1956 and is appointed by the governor. The committee's executive secretary is always to be the director of the Department of Industrial Relations, so that agency can assist in clerical work, mailing, and other administrative matters. The purpose of the committee, as stated by the governor, is to direct attention to the ascertaining of problems which are not adequately being dealt with by existing governmental agencies and to find out to what extent present public services can be harnessed on the state level, local level, and the federal level to deal with these problems.

Oregon. The Governor's Inter-Agency Committee on Agricultural Labor was set up in 1957, and all appointments are made by the governor. The member agencies support their own activities. The committee is to co-operate in developing a coordinated program to assist in the administration of the various agency functions in order to render maximum service to both agricultural employers and workers.

Pennsylvania. The Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor was created in 1952, and appointments are made by the governor. The committee has no separate budget, but staff services are provided mainly by the Department of Labor and Industry. The purpose of the Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor is to assure that migrant farm labor is brought to, maintained, and works in Pennsylvania under conditions meeting satisfactory standards of housing, sanitation, health, and welfare. As this is the responsibility of many state departments, the committee is devoted to organizing the participation and coordination of member departments at the state and community level.

South Carolina. The Committee for Development and Improvement of Migratory Workers was organized as an interagency committee in 1954. It has no separate budget, and the agency members support their own activities. The stated purpose of the committee is to improve living conditions of migrants, including water supply, garbage disposal, and screening of migrant labor camps.

Texas. The Council on Migrant Labor was created by the Texas legislature in 1957 and is financed from state appropriations. The purpose of the council is to: 1) promote the formulation of rules by the various agencies represented for the betterment of the migrants' travel and living conditions; 2) facilitate interdepartmental agreements; 3) study the problems related to migrant labor in Texas; 4) analyze state and federal rules affecting migrant labor to determine their effect on laborers and employers; and 5) advise and consult with interested groups.

Washington. The Subcommittee on Migratory Farm Labor was formed as a subcommittee of the Governor's Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958. The agency members share the cost of financing the subcommittee's activities. The stated purpose of the subcommittee is to improve the effectiveness of work of each of the affected state agencies through joint planning, mutual assistance, and improved understanding and to study and evaluate problems concerning migratory farm labor.

Wisconsin. The State Migrant Committee was organized as a committee of the Wisconsin Welfare Council, a voluntary nonprofit state-wide social planning organization in 1950. The purpose of the committee is to coordinate the activities of state agencies and voluntary organizations which have interest in and/or programs for migrant workers and to provide "central services," i.e., produce motion pictures, act as a clearinghouse, secure new programs.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION: PROPOSED AND ENACTED

Legislative Proposals

Eleven bills relating to migrant labor were introduced in the United States Senate in 1961. These bills were developed and recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare. This subcommittee, chaired by Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (New Jersey), began its nation-wide study of migrant labor problems in 1959.

Five of these bills pertained to the farm labor market and its organization. The specific subjects covered by these five bills included: 1) minimum wage for agricultural workers; 2) registration of labor contractors; 3) agricultural child labor; 4) stabilization of the agricultural work force; and 5) agricultural labor relations. Two bills related to education: one providing for the education of migrant children and the other providing for the education of migrant adults. The other bills included the following subjects: 1) housing aids for growers; 2) improved health services for migrant families; 3) improved welfare services for migrant children; and 4) establishment of a citizens' council on migratory labor.

Explanation of Proposed Legislation

Minimum Wage (S. 1122). This bill would establish an agricultural minimum wage which would increase annually until it equals the industrial minimum wage level. The minimum would be $.75 per hour the first year, $.85 the second year, $1 the third year, and the industrial minimum the fourth year. The wage paid to an agricultural employee is defined as including the reasonable costs, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, of board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished the employee. The piece rate system would be preserved by a provision authorizing any piece rate that yields, for at least 90 per cent of the employees working at such piece rate, actual wages equal to the minimum hourly wage.

Coverage under the bill would extend to all employees performing hired farm labor for an employer who used more than 560 man days of hired farm labor in any one of the four preceding calendar quarters. The effect of the 560 man-day test would be to apply minimum wage requirements to farm enterprises using approximately seven or eight full-time employees during a calendar quarter. It was estimated by the subcommittee that the test would apply to about 50,000 farms, thus providing minimum wage coverage for approximately one million farm employees.

Exempted from the minimum wage requirements would be members of employers' immediate families and sharecroppers or members of sharecroppers' immediate families working on or in connection with the sharecroppers' tracts of land.

With respect to this legislation, Senator Williams made the following comment:[1]

> Today, agriculture is expressly excluded from minimum wage coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The average migratory farm worker with a month or more of farm work in 1959 obtained only 119 days of farm work for which he received $710 in cash wages. Supplementing this with a few days of nonfarm work, his total average annual wage was only $911. Only six of the 23 largest migrant-user states have agricultural minimum wage laws. All of these are elective and apply only to women and children.

Labor Contractor Regulation (S. 1126). This bill would establish a system of federal registration of agricultural labor contractors. Certificates of registration would be issued by the Secretary of Labor to agricultural labor contractors: 1) who submit information concerning their conduct and method of operation as a migratory agricultural labor contractor, their financial responsibility, and information on transportation, wage arrangements, housing, and other working conditions to be afforded migratory workers; and 2) who submit proof of existence of public liability insurance for damage to persons or property arising from the operation of vehicles in connection with activities as an agricultural labor contractor. A labor contractor's certificate of registration, after notice and hearing, could be suspended or revoked by the Secretary of Labor upon making certain specified findings of malfeasance in such labor contractor's activities. Such findings, among other things, would include: 1) giving false or misleading information to migratory workers concerning the terms, conditions, or existence of agricultural employment; 2) failure to perform agreements entered into with farm operators; 3) failure to comply with working arrangements made with migratory workers; and 4) engaging in illegal activities on or near the vicinity of premises being used to house migratory workers.

Child Labor (S. 1123). This measure would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to prohibit agricultural child labor outside of school hours for children below the age of 15. For children 14-15, nonharmful agricultural employment could be authorized by Department of Labor regulations; however, particularly hazardous employment would be completely barred for all children up to 18. Children could be employed by a parent or someone standing in place of a parent for work on the home farm in any occupation other than manufacturing or mining or an occupation found to be particularly hazardous or detrimental to their health or well-being. (Agricultural labor contractors could not be regarded as standing in place of a parent.)

Senator Williams made the following comment on this proposal:[2]

---

1. Fact Sheet on Eleven Point Legislative Program Relating to Migratory Farm Worker Problems Introduced by Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. February 28, 1961, p.2.
2. Ibid., p. 3.

> Present Federal child labor laws expressly exempt agricultural employment outside of school hours, and as a result a great many children are employed in work detrimental to their health or well-being. In 1959, only the extractive and construction industries exceeded agriculture in the rate of deaths from accidents. A special report on Work Injuries in California Agriculture, based on workmen's compensation reports, shows that in 1959 more than 550 paid workers under 18 years of age were injured seriously while employed on farms in that state alone. One-fifth of these injuries were to children under 16.

Labor Force Stabilization (S. 1129). This bill is designed to stabilize and insure an adequate, well-trained domestic farm labor force through: 1) improved programs of recruitment, transportation, and distribution of domestic agricultural workers; and 2) assurances and guarantees respecting the rights and obligations of agricultural employers and employees using the recruitment program. Participation in the recruitment program by either farmer or worker would be on a strictly voluntary basis; during participation, both would continue to have free choice as to whether to enter into work agreements with each other.

To achieve these two objectives, the bill adds a new section to the Wagner-Peyser Act (referred to as "Title II") which makes applicable to the recruitment and employment of domestic farm workers various recruitment aids and procedures similar in nature to those now used to recruit foreign and Puerto Rican workers for agricultural work in the United States. For example, the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to furnish: 1) transportation, food and housing to domestic farm workers and their families while in transit to or from employment areas; 2) emergency medical care while in transit; and 3) subsistence and medical care at reception centers. For this service agricultural employers would reimburse the United States in an amount not to exceed $15 for each job filled; however, employers would be supplied replacement workers without additional reimbursement, if workers failed to fulfill their work agreements. Assurances to the worker, to be contained in an agreement between employers and workers, would provide among other things that wages shall be at least equal to the prevailing wages paid local workers for similar work; that not less than 160 hours of employment in each four-week period is guaranteed by the employer to any out-of-area worker; and that housing and sanitary facilities furnished by the employer would conform to minimum standards prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

To prevent infringement upon job opportunities of local workers, Title II would also provide that farm workers would not be moved into a local work area unless the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies that: 1) the area has an insufficient supply of local workers; 2) employment of out-of-area workers will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of local farm workers; and 3) reasonable efforts have been made by employers to attract and retain local workers for such employment at wages, hours, and working conditions comparable to those offered out-of-area workers.

Another significant feature of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to expend $200,000 annually to undertake special studies and projects leading to fuller utilization of under-employed rural Americans and to meeting the labor requirements of employers. Such projects and studies may include, but would not be limited to, special job training, counseling, resettlement, and overnight rest stops.

With respect to this legislation, Senator Williams made the following comments:[3]

> The present federal-state farm placement system is too limited to serve the number of growers and workers who could benefit from it. Presently, only about 120,000 out of approximately one million agricultural workers receive some service under this plan. Workers travelling without information may, upon arrival, have to wait for work to begin, may not arrive until after they are needed, or may not even know of areas of greater productivity or new cultivation. Insecurity and instability in present agricultural employment makes this important work unattractive to many potential agricultural workers. Furthermore, increased mechanization has replaced many former farm worker jobs, shifted others and created an ever-growing need for increased skills at the working level. In Wisconsin, in 1960, for example, mechanical harvesting accounted for 90 per cent of the sweet corn, 95 per cent of the snap bean and 72 per cent of the dry onion crops. During the same period 4000 of the State's workers were displaced by mechanization. In New Jersey, in the same year, 2500 workers were similarly displaced.

Agricultural Labor Relations (S. 1128). The purpose of this bill is to apply collective bargaining rights to agriculture. To achieve this purpose, the bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act by removing the exemption for agricultural employees and by including agriculture in the special provisions in section 8(f) covering the construction and building industries. Section 8(f) would allow agreements between agricultural employers and unions primarily engaged in organizing agricultural employees: 1) without prior establishment of union majority status, but the majority principal of the act would be preserved by allowing unions showing sufficient interest to petition for election; 2) requiring union membership on the seventh day of employment; 3) giving the union first option on new employment opportunities and referrals; and 4) specifying certain objective criteria for referral of employees for employment.

Presently, the National Labor Relations Act expressly exempts agricultural employees from its benefits. As a result, bargaining positions are unequal, and attempts to organize or strike bring undue economic and social disruption to agriculture to the detriment of the worker, the employer, and the public generally.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 8.

Education of Migrant Children (S. 1124). The purpose of this bill is to provide more adequate educational opportunities for the children of migratory farm workers. The bill would establish a three-part, five-year program of federal assistance to state and local communities seriously affected by the impact of migratory children at harvest time. Federal assistance would be in the form of: 1) payments to state educational agencies for part of the average cost of educating migratory children, 75 per cent for the first two years and 50 per cent for the next three years; 2) grants of $300,000 annually for each of five years to state educational agencies, local educational agencies or institutions of higher learning for summer schools for migratory children; and 3) grants of $250,000 annually for each of five years for state and interstate planning and coordination of programs concerning educational problems of migratory children. The grant moneys would be allotted among states on the basis of relative population of migratory agricultural workers. Schools in home-base states enrolling migratory children would be eligible to receive aid under the bill.

Education of Migrant Adults (S. 1125). This bill would provide a program of fundamental, practical education for adult migratory workers. Federal grants totaling $250,000 a year for each of five years would be available to state educational agencies, local educational agencies or institutions of higher education to defray operating costs for such programs. Grant moneys would be allotted on the basis of states' relative population of migratory agricultural employees.

Senator Williams' comment on this proposal follows:[4]

> The lack of fundamental knowledge by adult migratory workers reduces their effectiveness on the job and also prevents them from becoming self-sufficient. Moreover, this educational handicap has been found in many instances to be one of the primary causes of the substandard living conditions of migratory workers. For example, their inability to understand and use simple sanitary facilities frequently produces unnecessary damage to property.

Housing (S. 1127). The purpose of this bill is to make federal housing aids more effectively applicable in the acceleration of new construction and the rehabilitation and improvement of housing for migratory farm workers. The aids would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and would be in the form of insured commercial loans, low cost direct loans, and, in certain hardship cases, modest grants to farmers and domestic farm workers. The insured loans could be made to any person, including persons desiring to erect rental-type housing, for the purpose of providing housing and related facilities for domestic farm workers. The amount of loans that could be insured in any fiscal year would not exceed 35 million dollars. An interest ceiling of 6 per cent per annum would apply, and no loan could exceed more than 90 per cent of the estimated value of the property covered by the loan. The direct loans, which are limited to nonprofit housing, would be made from a 25 million dollar revolving fund to a farm owner, an association of farmers, a state or political subdivision thereof, or a public or private nonprofit organization. The amount of direct loan funds available for related facilities would be limited to three million dollars outstanding at any one time.

---

[4] Ibid., p.4.

The home ownership aids for the domestic farm worker and his family would be of three types. One would give the worker the opportunity to participate in and acquire a home through a housing project sponsored by a public or private nonprofit organization. The housing project would be financed by a direct loan from the $25 million revolving fund, with the workers themselves contributing labor wherever feasible; subsidiary home ownership loans would be made by the nonprofit organization to the worker. The second aid would provide a direct loan to a farm worker who is in need of decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling but is without financial resources to obtain such dwelling and who meets specified criteria as to ability to repay the loan. A farm worker not able to meet the repayment criteria would have recourse to a third aid which would provide a grant, not exceeding $500, a long-term, low interest loan not exceeding $1,000, or a combination loan-grant not exceeding $1,000.

The need for this bill was explained by Senator Williams as follows:[5]

> The economic usefulness of migratory worker housing is generally limited to the short duration of the harvest season. Because of the extremely high investment risk arising from this fact, mortgage money has not been readily available in this area. The practical consequence is that the farmer must finance his farm worker housing from profits, or mortgage his entire farm land, equipment and machinery to finance a relatively minor part of his operation, neither of which can be regarded as a sound transaction from a business viewpoint. The emergence of new and more rigid state housing sanitation codes will produce greater needs for mortgage money, which means, of course, that the already difficult problems in this area can be expected to grow worse in future years. The farm worker himself and his home ownership aspirations are a significant part of these problems. He sometimes succeeds in acquiring title to a plot of land in fringe areas near cities. Generally, however, the financial resources of farm workers are exhausted in the first step of acquisition of the land and because of this their dwellings are frequently found to be ramshackle, patchwork shacks. These conditions, coupled with the present lack of Federal housing aids, constitute one of the major factors for the existence today of large amounts of substandard housing for migratory farm workers.

---

[5] Ibid., p.6.

Health Services (S. 1130). This bill would authorize federal grants up to $3 million annually to states and local communities to stimulate and support programs designed to improve health services for and health conditions of domestic migratory farm workers and their families. The grants would be made by the surgeon general of the United States Public Health Service to public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations for paying part of the cost of special health projects in areas seriously affected by the seasonal impact of migratory farm workers. Grant moneys could also be used to conduct studies and demonstrations, to train federal or other personnel in methods of providing migratory health services, and to encourage intrastate or interstate programs to improve the health conditions of migratory workers and their families. The surgeon general is authorized to appoint an expert advisory committee to advise him relative to the administration of the grant program, including the development of program policies and the review of grant applications. The program would operate through local, state, and federal public health agencies in accordance with the well-established, highly successful pattern of relationships among such agencies.

Child Welfare Services (S. 1131). The purpose of this bill is to amend the Social Security Act to authorize up to $750,000 matching grants to states for the establishment and operation of day-care centers for migratory farm children. The amount of federal grants would be determined by the matching formula in the child welfare services section of the Social Security Act. Under such formula, the federal grant would vary according to the state's per capita income, but in no case would the grant be less than one-third or more than two-thirds. State residence requirements would not bar otherwise eligible children from benefits under the bill. Welfare services and benefits, for which migratory farm children are currently eligible under section 521 of the Social Security Act, would continue to be available after enactment of this bill. The cost of section 521 benefits would not be considered as part of the grants authorized by this bill.

National Citizens' Council (S. 1132). This bill has as its purpose the establishment of a "National Citizens' Council on Migratory Labor." The council would be composed of 13 members appointed by the President as follows: two to represent growers; two to represent migrant workers; three with interest in and general knowledge of migratory worker problems; two with experience in migratory worker health problems; two with experience in the welfare problems of migratory children; and two experienced state officials with knowledge of migratory worker problems.

The duties of the council would be to advise the President and the Congress concerning: 1) the operation of federal laws, regulations, programs and policies relating to any and all aspects of migratory agricultural labor; and 2) any and all other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor. The council would also have the duty to consider, analyze, and evaluate problems relating to migratory agricultural labor with a view to devising plans and making recommendations for the establishment of policies and programs to meet such problems. The council would inform the general public on these matters and, in addition, would hold both national and regional conferences on the problems in this area.

Action on Proposed Legislation

Bills Passed. Only one of the 11 legislative proposals passed both houses of Congress. S. 1130 authorizing grants for health services was adopted, but no appropriation was made to implement the provisions of this act.

Adopted by One House. Four other measures passed in the Senate. These included: S. 1123, child labor; S. 1124, education of migrant children; S. 1126, registration of labor contractors; and S. 1132, advisory citizens' council. The measure on child labor reached the floor of the House, was drastically amended, and never came to a vote. The other three bills reached the House Rules Committee, where no action was taken on the education and advisory citizens' council bills and the one on contractor registration was tabled.

No Action. The other six proposed bills were not reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. These included: S. 1122, minimum wage; S. 1125, education of migrant adults; S. 1127, housing assistance; S. 1128, agricultural labor relations; S. 1129, labor force stabilization; and S. 1136, child welfare services.

Other Legislation Affecting Migrants

Several other measures passed by the Eighty-seventh Congress could benefit migrant workers and their families. These bills include:

1) The manpower development and training act;

2) the area redevelopment act; and

3) the rural housing programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Application to Migrants

Manpower and Area Redevelopment Acts. Training for new job opportunity is now available for underemployed farm workers and low income farm families. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, underemployed farm workers and farm families (with less than $1,200 annual income) are eligible for training, either for skilled agricultural jobs or for non-farm work. The Manpower Act applies to all sections of the United States. Under the Area Redevelopment Act, areas which are designated as distressed include training programs in their over-all economic development plans. Farm or urban workers are eligible for training in these designated areas. To receive training under the provisions of these acts, farm workers not only must meet eligibility requirements, but, also, there must be reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the worker is to be trained.

Rural Housing Programs. Low interest loans are available through the Farmers Home Administration for improving on-the-farm labor housing or establishing community farm labor housing. Also of importance for farm labor families are several new low interest rural housing programs which will help a "settling migrant" or a migrant at his home base to acquire a home of his own. A small grants program is available which will help a farm worker make his home safe and sanitary. There is also a new rural housing program for the aging.

Day Care for Migrant Children. The Children's Bureau budget as authorized by the Senate and the House includes $5,650,000 for grants for maternal and child welfare, $5 million of which was earmarked for day care services. Children's Bureau funds will also provide $650,000 for training child welfare personnel. Because this large inclusive bill for day care services was under consideration, Congress did not look favorably on the idea of providing designated funds for day care of migratory farm workers' children. The assumption was that migrant children should have their fair share of the $5 million general day care fund and not the designated amount proposed in S. 1130. The day care appropriation was included in the supplemental appropriation bill upon which Congress took no action prior to adjournment. This bill will be reintroduced in the upcoming session.